T307

LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE VIJAYANAGARA EMPIRE

A. V. VENKATA RATNAM, M.A (Mysore), M.A. (Columbia)
Lecturer, Department of Post-graduate Studies and Research in History
Mysore University

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN HISTORY TO KARNATAK UNIVERSITY, DHARWAR
1970

A C K N O W L E D G M E N T

I gratefully acknowledge my gratitude and respect to Dr.G.S. Dikshit, M.A., Ph.D., Professor and Head of the Department of History, Karnatak University, Dharwar, under whom I worked. His encouragement, help and keen interest in the work from the choice of the subject till the completion and the instructions given to me ~~almost daily~~ frequently enabled me to complete this research work.

My humble thanks are due to Dr.K.V. Ramesh, Deputy Superintending Epigraphist, Office of the Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore, who went through the typescript and helped me with useful criticisms.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to Dr.G.S. Gai, Chief Epigraphist, Archaeological Survey of India, Mysore, for giving me permission to make use of his office library, and the librarians of Karnatak, Madras and Mysore Universities.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN THE VIJAYANAGARA EMPIRE

(A.D. 1336-1565)

C O N T E N T S

Acknowledgments 1 - 14

CHAPTER I: Introduction and Central Government

Section 1: (i) Nature and Scope, (ii) Survey of the Sources - Epigraphical - Literary - Foreign Evidence.

Section 2: Central Government: The King.

Section 3: The Yuvarāja.

Section 4: Co-rulership.

Section 5: Checks on royal authority: Dharma Custom and Public opinion - The organized Community.

Section 6: The Council of Ministers.

CHAPTER II: Provincial Government - Official & Feudal 15 - 38

Official:

Section 1: The extent of the empire.

Section 2: Provincial Divisions.

Section 3: Provincial Organization.

Section 4: The Nāyankara System.

Section 5: Control of Provincial Organizations.

Fuedal:

Section 6: The Nāyakas of Keladi.

Section 7: The Nāyakas of Madura.

CHAPTER III: Villages and Agrahāras 39 - 139

Section 1: Administrative divisions.

Section 2: Village Administration of South India in the Pre-Vijayanagara period.

Section 3: Kinds of the Village assembly in the Vijayanagara period - Ūr or Ūru, Okkalu, Praje, Halaru, The Eighteen Castes, Jamani, Jagattu, Gancar[illegible].

Section 4: Composition ofthe village Assembly.

Section 5: The Meetings of the Village Assembly.

Section 6: Venue of the Village Assembly.

Section 7: Officials of the Village - Gauṇḍa, Gancara, Sēnabōva, Jyōtisha, Purōhita, Talāri - other Village servants.

Section 8: Their Remuneration.

Section 9: Functions of the Village Assembly - Transactions relating to village lands, Transaction relating to revenue matters - Judicial functions - Exchange of land - Confiscation of the lands of guilty persons - Control over temples within their jurisdiction - Opinions of Scholars on the subject of Village Assemblies in this period.

Section 10: Agrahāras and their formation - By Kings or their officers - By Village and nāḍu assemblies - Revival of old agrahāras.

Section 11: Officers of the Agrahāra - Māsaveggades or monthly headmen - Buddhivantaru - Grāma hebbāruva, hebbārvakkalu, hebbār, prabhu, odeya - mūligaru.

Section 12: The Mahājana Assembly- Summons to the Mahājana meetings - Venue of the Mahājana meetings - conduct of meetings.

Section 13: Functions of the Mahājana Assembly - Religious Aspects - Administrative Aspects - Building Activities - Economic activities - Social aspects - Judicial powers - other activities.

Section 14: Disappearance of some Agrahāras - [illegible] - Bāḷguḷi.

× Section 15: History of Kuduvaḷḷi agrahāra - The Mahājana assembly of Upēndrapura (Maddur in Yelandur hobli) and Narasiṁhachaturvēdimaṅgala (Maddur in Mandya district) and their activities - Keḷasa agrahāra - corporate life in the agrahāras.

CHAPTER IV: The Mahānāḍu and the Nāḍu: 140 - 197

Section 1: Introductory - The Mahānāḍu in Pre-Vijayanagara Times.

Section 2: The Mahānāḍu and other larger assemblies in the Vijayanagara period - their functions.

Section 3: The Nāḍu: Introductory - The Nāḍu in Pre-Vijayanagara times.

Section 4: Officers of the Nadu - The Nad-Gaunda, the Nad-Prabhus - Appointment of the Nad-gaunda. His remuneration - His functions - Superintendent of the Nadu - The Nad-Senabova.

Section 5: The Nadu Assembly - composition.

Section 6: Meetings of the Nadu Assembly.

Section 7: Functions of the Nadu Assembly - Remission of taxes - Settlement of bounderies - Administration of justice - Temple affairs - Land gifts to temples - Endowments of taxes, cash and goods to temples - Land grants for charitable purposes - Appreciation of work done for public purposes - grants of land in the presence of the people - Formation of agrahāras - Donation to chhatras and mathas - Nadu duties.

Section 8: Representative institutions of the Āraga-Eighteen Kampanas.

CHAPTER V: Towns and Guilds: 198 - 243

Section 1: Introductory.

Section 2: Formationof towns - Vijayanagara and its suburbs - Śrigirisamudra - Bommanahalli - Tirumalapuri - Krishnapura - Ānegundi - Anantapur - Piriyarājapattana - Fairs and their establishment.

Section 3: Some important urban centres.

Section 4: Guild Assemblies - The Craft Guild - The Merchant guild.

Section 5: Their leaders - the Pattanasvāmi, the leader of the Ubhaya-nānādési, mahāvaddavyavahāri, Vadda-byavahāri, Pattaviyāpāri, Setti, Svāmitana, Prithuvi-setti, Setti-pattanasvāmi, Purapati.

Section 6: The Pattanasvāmi - The mode of appointment - His remuneration and functions - Voice in revenue matters - raised tolls at fairs - Voice in land grants.

Section 7: The Town Assembly - Nagara - evidence of Vaiśyapurānamu - The assemblies of Bidire and Talakādu.

Section 8: Divisions of Towns - Kēris or Quarters - Bārakūru - activities of the merchants of Paduvakēri in Basarūru.

Section 9: Guilds in South Kanara - Hañjamāna, Nakhara, Elame, Salikeya ballālugalu, Settikāra, Janani or Janni, Samastakattaleyavaru.

CHAPTER VI: Conclusion 244 - 247

Existence of many local bodies - Local self-governing institutions did not die during this period - their autonomous spirit - popular and representative

character - the Vijayanagara rulers did not curb their autonomy - Rise of feudatories after the days of Krishnadēva Rāya, and the battle of Rakkasa-Tangaḍi led to their decline.

Appendix Temples and Maṭhas: 248 - 271

Section 1: Introductory - Study of the Tirupati temple.

Section 2: Royal benefactions.

Section 3: Public patronage.

Section 4: Temple administration.

Section 5: Functions discharged by the temple :- Promotion of agriculture - temple treasury, a bank - Encouragement of learning.

Section 6: Maṭhas - The Śriṅgēri maṭha - a cluster of Hermitages transformed into a Samsthānam.

Section 7: Royal benefactions.

Section 8: Grants from local bodies and private grants.

Section 9: Functions of the Maṭha - an autonomous body.

Abbreviations: 272 - 273

Bibliography: 274 - 284

Maps:

(1) Rājyas under Krishṇadēva Rāya in the Vijayanagara Empire.

(2) Vijayanagara city and its suburbs.

(3) Vijayanagara Empire - Important towns.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

Section 1:

(1) Nature and Scope

This work is an attempt at describing the organization and working of local government in the Vijayanagara empire. One of the reasons for writing this thesis is the controversy concerning this subject. Scholars like K.V. Subramanya Iyer, K.A. Nilakanta Sastri etc., hold the view that self-governing local bodies were no longer in existence during this period. On the other hand, we have the view of S. Krishnasvami Aiyangar and B.A. Saletore that these bodies continued to flourish during this period also and the rulers continued to encourage them. T.V. Mahalingam observes that the numerous village republics show signs of decay and disruption in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and though there are references to local institutions in the late Vijayanagara period, they had lost by that time much of their vitality and capacity for initiative.[1] We have still another view put forth by A.Krishnaswami who adopts a middle course by stating that the Vijayanagara rulers only allowed the local institutions to continue where they had existed but did not actively develop

---

1. Mahalingam, T.V. South Indian Polity, (Madras, 1955) p.370.

them. Hence it is necessary to make a complete analysis of the local bodies during this period to find out the validity of these views and understand their character and spirit.

The foundation of the Vijayanagara Empire in the thirties of the fourteenth century opened a new chapter in the history of South India. The battle of Tālikōṭa (Rakkasa-Taṅgaḍi) on the 23rd January 1565 resulted in the Vijayanagara army being completely routed by the allied forces of the Sultans of Bijapur, Ahmadnagar, Golkonda and Bidar. It was a catastrophe which changed the entire course of South Indian History. Hence the period ending with this battle is a convenient point at which to stop this enquiry. The Empire of Vijayanagara lasted another century under the Āravīḍu family, the fourth and last dynasty that succeeded in salvaging the imperial crown from utter confusion. But its foundations had been deeply shaken, and it did not rise again to its former zenith of glory. Though, as has been said, this work confines itself in the main to the period till 1565, the subsequent period is not altogether neglected.

The work is divided into six chapters. Chapter one deals with the sources, followed by a brief review of the Central Government, which is intended to serve as a background to the study of local administration. The next chapter is

concerned with a brief survey of provincial government, official and feudal. It describes the political divisions and organizations with particular reference to the Keḷadi and Madura principalities which had rulers who claimed to enjoy a semi-independent status.

The next chapter deals with the villages and agrahāras. The village assemblies, the village executive and the functions of the village assemblies are described along with some aspects of life in a few villages under their assemblies. The formation of the agrahāras, their officers, the Mahājana assembly and its functions are then discussed. The chapter ends with the history of Kuḍuvaḷḷi agrahāra and an account of the activities of the agrahāra assemblies of Upēndrapura, Narasiṁhachaturvēdimaṅgala and Kaḷasa. Temples and maṭhas played an important part in local administration and this is described with particular reference to the administration of the Tirupati temple and the Śriṅgēri maṭha at the end of the thesis as an appendix to the chapter on the agrahāras.

From the villages and agrahāras we go to a description of the Mahānāḍu assembly and the Nāḍu assembly. The officers of the Nāḍu, their remuneration and functions are then examined. This chapter on the Mahānāḍu and the Nāḍu closes with a description of the activities of the assemblies of Āraga-Eighteen Kampaṇa which had representative institutions.

Towns and Guilds form the subject matter of the fifth chapter. The formation and the growth of towns with particular reference to the city of Vijayanagar and a few other towns, Town Assemblies, their executive and their functions, the guilds in South Kanara, ~~a few other merchant and caste guilds~~ and their role in town administration are described in that order, followed by the results of the survey at the end of the chapter.

(ii) Survey of the Sources:

(A) Epigraphical

Inscriptions are the most authentic and the largest single source of information for our study. They are found written on stone and on copper plates. Many of them record gifts for charitable purposes. Records of gifts made by the kings contain details of taxes remitted in favour of the donee and privileges conferred on them. They also throw light on other details of the administrative set-up and policy. The details regarding the donor, the donee and the gift made, are useful for our purpose. The donors might be the king's officers or the village assembly or the agrahāra assembly or the associations like merchant-guilds or private individuals. The donees might be an individual or a group or an institution. We also get a description of the object given, money, taxes and land with its boundaries carefully specified.

Donative inscriptions have a high utilitarian value for the student of local government. They refer to administrative divisions such as Sīmas or nādus, grāmas (villages), the agrahāra (exclusively Brahman) village and the nagara or the town. Inscriptions refer to the popular assemblies in the various administrative units, their officers, their meetings and the functions performed by them. They throw light on their corporate character. All these furnish matter for the study of local government. Rice rightly observed that an endless variety of details might be collected from the inscriptions to illustrate different features in administration.[2]

The next important source of our knowledge is literary evidence. It is both indigenous and foreign. Since the Vijayanagara rulers in their inscriptions claim to be followers of the "ancient constitutional usage" (Pūrvada maryāde), the literary works of the pre-Vijayanagara period are of value to us. Vijñāneśvara's Mitākshara for understanding the part played by the guilds, Sōmeśvara III's Encyclopaedia Manasōllāsa for polity contain valuable information. Parāśara-Mādhavīyam, a copious commentary on the text of Parāśara by Mādhava while he was minister of Bukka I, the king of Vijayanagara deals with Rājadharma[3] and a mixture of law, morality and religion.

---

2. Rice, Lewis B. Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions, (London, 1909), p.184.
3. Parāśara-Mādhavīya, edited by Venkanna, Chincholi (Bangalore, 1890), pp. 259-279.

Krishnadēva Rāya's Telugu poem *Āmuktamālyada* contains an exposition of the principles of administration which he practised. Bhaskaracharya's *Vaiśyapurāṇamu*, a Telugu *padyakāvya* purported to have been written in A.D.1508 is indispensable for the study of Towns and Guilds in Vijayanagara. Indian literary evidence for the history of Vijayanagar is accessible in two collections of select source brought out by the University of Madras.[4]

Foreign evidence is also of value to us. The Italian visitor, Nicolo Conti who came to the city of Vijayanagara in 1420 or 1421 was the first European visitor. The Persian ambassador Abdur Razzak came to Vijayanagar.at about the same time. Athanasius Nikitin, the Russian trader spent some time in the Deccan round about A.D.1470. The Portuguese sources are of critical importance for the recreation of sixteenth century Vijayanagara. Duarte Barbosa who was in India from A.D.1500 to about A.D.1516, Domingos Paes, from A.D.1520-22 and Fernao Nuniz, who spent three years in Vijayanagara (A.D.1535-37), are of value not only for the history of this period but also for the state of administration and society at the time.[5] Another Portuguese visitor

---

4. a) Aiyangar, S.K.: *Sources of Vijayanagara History* (Madras, 1919).
   b) Nilakanta Sastri, K.A. and Venkataramanayya, N. *Further Sources of Vijayanagara History* (Madras 1946).

5. Sewell, Robert,: *A Forgotten Empire* (First Indian Edition, 1962).

was Pires who, writing between A.D.1512 and A.D.1518, published accounts of Vijayanagar around the middle of the sixteenth century.[6]

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

Section 2

The King:

The object of giving this sketch of the central government is to describe in the barest outline, the mechinery of administration which would serve as a background to local government, and emphasise those aspects which had a bearing upon the local administration. Regarding the relations between Central and Local governments, Dr.S.K. Aiyangar observes: "The civil administration was so organised over this vast region that the people carried on the administration themselves more or less completely subject to the supervision and control of the great officers of state, who constituted a comparatively small hierarchy touring the country to set matters right, wherever their attention should be called for."[7] It shall be our endeavour in this thesis to explain the truth of the above statement.

Let us first refer to Kingship in the Vijayanagara empire. The coronation Ceremony which provided the legal

6. Lach, Donald F.: India in the Eyes of Europe The Sixteenth Century. (Chicago, 1968).

7. Aiyangar, S.K.: Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture, (Calcutta, 1923) pp.301-2, 410-411.

sanction for a King to govern was duly performed. This is supported by the evidence of contemporary foreign travellers confirmed by inscriptions. The coronation was attended by the subordinate kings and leaders of the community. According to the Krishnarāyavijayamu of Kumāra Dhūrjaṭi, the coronation of Krishṇadēva Rāya was attended by many feudatory chiefs.[8] The coronation had great constitutional significance It meant the assumption of his responsibility by the king.

The duties of the king are thus stated by Krishṇadēva Rāya in Āmuktamālyada: "......... So with great care and according to your power you should attend the work of protecting (the good) and punishing (the wicked) without neglecting anything that you see or hear. In the case of impossibilities, you should throw the burden on the God Vishṇu (Puṇḍarīkāksha) who is the protector of the afflicted who take refuge in him".[9] ~~As stated before,~~ A crowned king should always rule with an eye towards Dharma. Further, "the lives of the Gods like Varuṇa, Indra, Vaiśravaṇa, Vāyu and Agni are the results of their actions in several previous births. The various words as the Bhū, Bhuvaḥ and Suraḥ owe their positions to Dharma. So, skilfully fulfilling your Dharma, you get rid of

---

8. S.K. Aiyangar,: Sources of Vijayanagar History (Madras, 1919) p.129.

9. Āmuktamālyada, Canto IV, translated by Ramasvami Sarasvati, in JIH, IV, p.iii, Verse 285.

your three-fold debt and attain fame among your equals."[10]

About the general conduct of a king Krishnadeva Raya laid down the following rules: "A king should rule collecting round him people skilled in statecrafts, should investigate the mines yielding precious metals in his kingdom and extract the same, should levy taxes from his people moderately, should counteract the acts of his enemies by crushing them with force, should be friendly, should protect one and all of his subjects, should put an end to the mixing up of the castes among them, should always try to increase the merit of the Brahmans, should strengthen his fortress and lessen the growth of the undesirable things and should be ever mindful of the purification of his cities and thus strengthen himself and increase his congenity just as a man strengthens his own body and increases his longevity by consulting good doctors, by learning the properties of the seven Dhātus.... ....."[11] The kings appointed Samayācaryas to enforce Svadharma on the respective castes and communities. They maintained the mathas in the kingdom and helped them financially. They paid due attention to the economic prosperity of the people. To promote agricultural prosperity forests were cleared, new villages were formed and fresh lands

10. Ibid., p.77.
11. JIH IV, p.iii, v.270.

brought under cultivation.[12] The administration of justice devolved on the king. He was the highest court of appeal.

Section 3

The Yuvarāja

The reigning sovereigns generally nominated their heirs-apparent in order that they might acquaint themselves with the machinery of administration. The successor was anointed as Yuvarāja. A copper-plate grant of Harihara II states that Harihara I appointed his brother Bukka Rāja as Yuvarāja.[13] The heir-apparent, or Yuvarāja and other princes were appointed as governors of provinces. This will be dealt with in a subsequent chapter. Literary evidence corroborates the existence of this system. The Achyutarāyābhyudayam of Rājanātha Ḍiṇḍima says that with the coronation of Acyuta as emperor, Pina Veṅkaṭādri, the king's son was anointed the Crown Prince.[14] When the prince had reached maturity, he was appointed the Viceroy or Governor of one of the provinces, an office which helped him to come into contact with the problems of state and acquire training in the administration.[15] It is likely that the sons of a ruling sovereign were appointed Viceroys of provinces, but only one of them was nominated the Yuvarāja or co-ruler and he succeeded to the throne.

12. Ibid., v.245.
13. EC, V, p.1, Cn.256.
14. Aiyangar, S.K.: Sources, p.158.
15. Mahalingam: Administration, p.12.

Mahalingam rightly points out that the selection of the ruler seems to have been made generally in the presence of the ministers and nobles. Barradas refers to this practice when he says, "three days before his death (the king Veṅkaṭa II) leaving aside, as I say, this putative son, called for his nephew Chica Raya, in presence of several of the nobles of the Kingdom, and extended towards him his right hand on which was the ring of state, and put it close to him, so that he should take it and should become his successor in the kingdom...... The old man then took the ring and held it on the point of his finger, offering it the second time to Chica Raya, who by the advice of the captains present took it, and placed on his hand and then on his finger, shedding many tears ... All these royal insignia he gave to his nephew Chica Raya as being his successor, and as such he was at once proclaimed while some rejoiced, others were displeased."[16] In the Vijayanagara period the kings nominated the <u>Yuvarāja</u> also with a view to avoid succession disputes.

In the history of Vijayanagara, regency was one of the problems connected with the Central Government. When the king was a minor, a regent was nominated to administer the Empire until the king came of age. In Vijayanagara history,

---

16. Sewell, Robert: <u>op.cit.</u>, pp.214-215.

there are many instances of the misuse of regency. We have the examples of Vīra Narasiṁha and Rāma Rāya. The former usurped the throne and founded the Tuḷuva dynasty. Sadāśiva Rāya was only nominally king, the real power being in the hands of Rāma Rāya and his two brothers, Tirumala and Veṅkaṭādri.

Section 4

Checks on Royal Authority:

The king was not an autocrat. As Mahalingam has pointed out, "The king was not an absolute, or autocratic ruler, for his powers were limited by certain checks and balances of a more or less conventional and customary character."[17]

As stated before, it was the king's duty to uphold and maintain Dharma. Kingship was subject to the reign of Dharma.

Custom and public opinion also acted as checks on the royal authority. Taxation was based on custom. The Vijayanagara kings imposed taxes based on custom. Custom governed the sale of land.[18] In A.D.1510, Krishṇadēva Rāya remitted

---

17. Mahalingam, Admn., p.5.
18. Ibid., p.22.

the marriage tax as public opinion was not in its favour.[19]

The organized community also acted as a check. There were the leagues and the guilds. There was the increasing amount and power of group life, trade unions and professional societies, citizens' leagues and neighbourhood associations.[20] There were the associations of the nanadésis, the nads, the ayyavole, craft guilds, the groups of ninety-eight sects, each of which had a definite organization. The communities made regulations for themselves and the king's duty was to enforce them. There was no interference by the state except when it was necessary to bring about harmony. In other words, the Central Government exercised a supervisory control over them.

Section 5

Council of Ministers:

The king was assisted by a council of ministers.[20a] It was probably composed of ministers appointed by the king and of the great nobles of the kingdom. It was consulted on state matters and policy. Abdur Razzaq noticed the place where the ministers worked. He says, "on the right hand of the palace of the Sultan (i.e., the Vijayanagar Emperor)

---

19. EC, XII, Mg.64.
20. Mahalingam, Admn., p.22.
20a Sewell, op. cit, pp 309-310, Amuktamalyada, op cit, v 209

there is the diwan-khana minister's office, which is extremely large........ "[21]

The sovereign's personality counts much in the working of a monarchical form of government. In the Vijayanagara empire, as Mahalingam has pointed out, the provincial governors enjoyed a good measure of local autonomy within their jurisdiction without interference from the Central government as long as they regularly discharged their obligations to it, and this forms the subject matter of the next chapter.

---

21. Elliot, History of India, (London, 1905) IV, p.107.

22. Mahalingam, SIP, p.317.

CHAPTER II

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT - OFFICIAL AND FEUDAL

Section 1

Official, The Extent of the Empire:

The Vijayanagara empire was founded by five brothers, Harihara, Kampa, Bukka, Mārappa and Muddappa in the second quarter of the 14th century. They expanded it on all sides, and each ruled over a portion of it. Kumāra Kampaṇa, the son of Bukka extended the empire as far as Madura.

In the hey-day of its glory, the Vijayanagara empire comprised almost the whole of India south of the river Kṛishṇā. About the limits of the empire under Dēva Rāya II, we have the evidence of the Persian ambassador, Abdur Razzak, who observes that the kingdom "extended from the borders of Saradip (Ceylon) to those of Kulbarga (Gulbarga), and from Bengal to Malibar, a space of more than 1,000 Parasangs.[1] Krishnadeva Raya's campaigns brought all Southern India under the sway of Vijayanagara.[2] The Portugese traveller Paes says, "you must know that this kingdom of Narasymha has three hundred graos of coast, each grao being a league, along the hill-range (Serra) of which I have spoken, until

1. Elliot, History of India, IV, p.105.
2. Sewell, op.cit., p.118.

you arrive at Ballagate and Charamaodel, (that is, Coromandel) which belong to this kingdom; and in breadth it is one hundred and sixty-four graos; each large grao measures two of our leagues, so that it has six hundred leagues of coast, and across it three hundred and forty-eight leagues.... across from Batacalla to the kingdom of Orya (Orissa).

And this kingdom marches with all the territory of Bengal, and on the other side with the kingdom of Orya, which is to the east, and on the other side to the north with the kingdom of Dakhan, belonging to which are the lands which the Ydallcao (The Adil Khan, Sultan of Bijapur) has, and Ozemelluco (The Nizam Shah, the Sultan of Ahmednagar)."[3] The empire was held intact under Acyuta Rāya. In 1565 A.D. the empire had its final tryst with destiny. It suffered a set back after the inglorious defeat at the battle of Rakasa-Taṅgaḍi.

Section 2

Provincial Divisions

The empire was divided for purposes of administration into a number of provinces called rājyas. They were also known as maṇḍalams[4] and nāḍus.[5] Mahalingam observes, "though

---

3. Ibid., pp.231-232.
4. Mahalingam, Administration, pp.279-80.
5. Saletore, Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire (2 Vols. Madras, 1934), I, p.328.

occasionally mention is made of the mandalas, they had no administrative significance".[6] Examples of the mandalas are the Jayangondasōlamandalam, Tondaimandalam and Cōlamandalam, Banavāsi 12000 or Banavāsi mandala. Though they were continued to be so called, yet they did not constitute any regular political division.

The Vijayanagara empire was composed of many principalities and divisions already in the time of Harihara I and Bukka I. Some of these were governed by Viceroys and princes of the ruling family. Others were looked after by the rulers themselves.[7]

(1) There were two rājyas in Tuluva. Bārakūr, which was a city of great importance and the seat of a Viceroy in charge of the northern portion of the Tulu country, and Mangalūru (Mangalore) which was the capital of the southern Tulu country. Other provinces were (2) Āraga, Āraga-Gutti or Malerājya (Shimoga district), Sāntalige 1000, part of Shimoga district and (3) the Udayagiri-rājya, (4) the Penugonda-rājya, the Muluvāyi-rājya and (6) the Rājagambhīra-rājya.[8] South of Rājagambhīra-rājya, we have Tiruvadigai-rājya and Pāndya or Madura rājya. Their number varied from time to time.

---

6. Mahalingam, SIP, p.306.
7. ASI, 1907-08, p.237.
8. Ibid., pp.234-254.

New ones were created depending on the exigencies of administration. Some were reduced in importance. For example, Gutti, a rājya upto the early years of Krishṇadēva Rāya's reign, became a sub-division of the Penugoṇḍa rājya towards the close of his reign.[9] Some of the new ones which were created were Śrī-Śaila-rājya, Tiruvadirājya (Travancore) and Koṇḍavīḍu.[10]

In this connection, a list of the important divisions of Karnataka during the Vijayanagara period may be given.[11]

1. Haive-rājya: Southern parts of North Kanara District.
2. Nagire-rājya: South-eastern extremes of the North Kanara and North-eastern of the South Kanara District.
3. Hāḍuvaḷḷi-rājya: South-western extremes of the North Kanara and north-western extremes of the South Kanara Districts.
4. Bārakūru-rājya: Northern half of the South Kanara District.
5. Maṅgaḷūru-rājya: Southern half of the South Kanara District.
6. Kaḷasa-Kārkaḷa-rājya: Kārkaḷa Taluk, South Kanara District and Kaḷasa Taluk of Shimoga District.
7. Āraga-rājya: Shimoga, Shikarpur, Nagar, Tirthahalli and Sorab Taluks, Shimoga District, and Koppa Taluk, Chikmagalur District.

---

9. EC, XII Mi.64; 332 of 1926.
10. C. Hayavadana Rao, Mysore Gazetteer (Bangalore, 1930) II iii, p.1530.
11. K.V. Ramesh, Vijayanagara and Territorial Re-adjustments in Karnāṭaka (Kannada Studies Vol.III, No.1) pp.39-51.

8. Chandragutti (or Gutti) rājya: Siddapur Taluk, North Kanara District and Shikarpur and Sagar Taluks, Shimoga District.

9. Hastināvati-valita: Bellary District.

10. Hoysaṇa-rājya or Hoysaṇa-nāḍu or Hosaṇa-dēśa: That part of Karnataka and Madras State which was under the sway of the Hoysaḷas before the founding of Vijayanagara.

11. Yakkati-Sīme: Kadur Taluk, Chikmagalur District and Holalkere Taluk, Chitradurga District.

12. Koṭṭūra-Chāvaḍi: Davanigere and Harihar Taluks, Chitradurga District.

13. Vasudhāreya-Sīme: Chikmagalur Taluk and District.

14. Penugoṇḍe-rājya: Sira and Pavagada Taluks, Tumkur District, Bagepalli Taluk, Kolar District and parts of Anantapur District (including Penukonda Taluk), Andhra Pradesh.

15. Honnāvaḷi-Sīme: Tiptur Taluk, Tumkur District and Arasikere Taluk, Hassan District.

16. Hāsana-Sīme: Hassan District.

17. Sādaḷiya-rājya: Chik-Ballapur and Sidlaghatta Taluks, Kolar District.

18. Muḷuvāya (or Muḷabāgila) rājya: Mulbagil Taluk, Kolar District, Kolar District and Hosakote and Anekal Taluks, Bangalore District.

19. Nallūra-rājya: Hosakote and Bangalore Taluks, Bangalore District.

20. Channapaṭṭana-rājya: Bangalore and Mandya Districts.

21. Aruḷahāḷa-rājya: Kanakanahalli Taluk, Bangalore District.

22. Changa-nāḍu: Arkalgud Taluk, Hassan District and Hunsur Taluk, Mysore District.

23. Kōṭe-Sīme: Hunsur and Heggadadevankote Taluks, Mysore District.

24. Terakaṇāmbi-rājya: Gundlupet Taluk, Mysore District.

The Tamil country was divided into five rājyas during the reign of Krishṇadēva Rāya. They were: 1) Chandragiri-rājyam, 2) Paḍaivīḍurājyam, 3) Tiruvadigairājyam, 4) Chōḷa-rājyam, 5) Madurarājyam or Pāṇḍyarājyam.[12]

In many inscriptions the terms Sīme, Sthaḷa, Vaḷita and Vēnthe replaced the term rājya. In other instances they were used to indicate smaller divisions within a rājya.

Section 3

Provincial Organization

A Viceroy or Governor was appointed over each province. These governors were generally members of the royal family. The princes of the first Vijayanagara dynasty who were appointed rulers of provinces assumed the title of Oḍeya or Uḍaiyār. When Harihara I was the King, Mārapa was the ruler of the province of Āraga with its capital at Chandragutti.[13] Kampaṇa I was the ruler of Udayagiri rājya.[14] Virūpākṣa, the son of Harihara II was in charge of the Tuṇḍīra, Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya countries and even conquered Ceylon.[15] Tirumala appointed his son Śrī Ranga II as the Viceroy ~~of the~~

---

12. Krishnasvami, A: The Tamil Country Under Vijayanagar (Annamalai University, 1964) p.161.
13. EC, VIII, Sb 375.
14. Nel. Ins., II, Nl.28.
15. EI, XII, pp.227-228.

of the home province, Penukoṇḍa.[16] Another son of the emperor Tirumala, Rāma was the Viceroy of the Śrīraṅgapaṭṭaṇa country.[17] Candragiri was the headquarters of Veṅkaṭa II, the fourth son of Tirumala. He was governing the Tamil country with many feudatories under him.[18] Thus the practice of appointing members of the royal family as governors or Mahāmaṇḍaleśvaras of provinces, which had been adopted by the Pallavas, the Chōḷas and the Hoysaḷas was followed by the Vijayanagara rulers also.

From the time of Dēvarāya II, we note a change of policy in the appointment of governors. Not only members of the royal family but also members belonging to the families of subordinate rulers and the nobility were chosen as governors. If it was thought fit that some eminent officer was suitable for the post, such an officer was also appointed governor of the province. This was probably due to many reasons. Firstly, members of the royal family with ability to discharge their duties as governors were not available. Moreover, with the expansion of the empire, there was an increase in the number of provinces and so more governors had to be appointed. Many of them combined in themselves the roles of a general as well as a minister (mahāpradhāna) and were placed in charge of more than one division at the same time. An inscription

---

16. EI, XII, pp. 173 and 186.
17. Aiyangar, S.K.: Sources, p.221: EC. XL 16.
18. Ibid., p.302.

of A.D.1475 from Chokkadi village in Udipi Taluk records that Viṭṭharasa Oḍeya was governing Bārakūru and Maṅgalūru rājyas under the orders of Mahāpradhāna Siṅgaṇṇa daṇṇāyaka.[19] They were loyal to the empire. The governors thus appointed were known as Daṇḍanāyakas. Mahalingam is of the view that in their relationship with the imperial house, their position was similar to that of the prince who served as provincial Viceroys.[20] They were also designated Durga Dannaik.[21] According to Mahalingam, they enjoyed a good measure of local autonomy within their jurisdiction without interference from the Central government as long as they discharged their obligations to it regularly.[22] They held their own courts, appointed their own officers and maintained their own armies. There was no time limit for the office. That depended upon the governor's ability, local necessity and the pleasure of the Emperors. They were allowed to issue their own coins generally of small denominations. A copper coin issued by Lakkaṇṇa Daṇḍanāyaka has the figure of an elephant on the reverse and the letter "L" above it and the obverse bears the legend "mana Danayakaru", probably standing for Lakshmaṇa Daṇḍanāyaka.[23] Caesar Frederick remarks: "When we came into

19. SII, VII, No.194; 579 of 1929-30.
20. Mahalingam, Admn., p.186.
21 N.Venkataramanayya: Studies in the History of the Third Dynasty of Vijayanagara (Madras, 1935) p.149.
22. Mahalingam, SIP, p.317.
23. ARSIE, 1905, para 31; IA, XX, p.304.

a new governor's territory as everyday we did, although they were all tributaries to the king of Bizenagar, yet every one of them stamped a small coyne of copper, so that the money we took this day would not serve the next day."[24]

The most important duty of the provincial governor was to protect his province from the attacks of the enemy. He was also the revenue officer of the province and probably also its chief magistrate. He was responsible for preserving law and order in the province. He enjoyed the right to impose new taxes or remit old ones. An inscription of about A.D.1370 from Chamarajanagara Taluk records that a charter was given by Chikka Kampaṇa Uḍaiyār to the officials and Kaikkolas of Hattalakote in which he made some regulations regarding tax payments and remission of the fines imposed on the Kaikkoḷas.[25] The governors had to make a fixed contribution of money to the imperial exchequer. Nuniz mentions some of the governors of the Kingdom, the revenues they held, the names of their provinces and their military and financial obligations to the imperial government.[26]

---

24. Purchas, Samuel, His Pilgrims (20 Vols. Glasgow 1905-07) X, p.99, Quoted in Admn., p.188.

25. EC, IV, Ch.97.

26. Sewell, op.cit., pp.365-370.

Name of the Governor	Annual Income	Military Contribution	Annual financial contribution to the king
1. Salvanayqye, the Minister of Acyuta Raya. Governor of Charamaodel (Choromandel), Nagapatan (Negapatam), Tangor (Tanjore) Bomgarin (not identified), Dapatao (Devipatnam), Truguel (Trukovil), Caullim (Kayal) bordering in Ceylon.	11,000000 Gold Pardaos	30,000 foot 3,000 horses 30 elephants	⅓
2. Ajaparcatimapa Governor of Hudogary (Udayagiri) Condovim (Kondavid), Penagundim (Pennukonda), Codegaral (Kanigiri, Nellore District) Cidaota (Siddhout or Siddharattam, Cuddapah district)	800000 Pardaos Gold	25,000 foot of 1,500 horses 40 elephants	300000 Pardaos
3. Gapanayqye, lord of Rosyl (Perhaps Rachol, near Goa)	600000 Pardaos	20,000 foot 2,500 horses 20 elephants	150000 Pardaos
4. Lepapayqye, lord of Vimgapor (Bankapur, South of Dharwar).	300000 Pardaos	20,000 foot 1,200 horses 28 elephants	80,000 Pardaos
5. Narvara, lord of Ondegema	400000 Pardaos	12,000 foot 600 horses 20 elephants	200000 Pardaos
6. Chinapanayque, lord of the land of Calay. (Possibly Kalale in Mysore)	300000 Pardaos	10,000 foot 800 horses	100000 Pardaos

7. Crimnapanaque, lord of Aosel (unidentified)	20000 Pardaos	700 foot 500 horses	7,000 Pardaos
8. Bajapanarque, lord of Bodial (Perhaps Budehal in Mysore)	300000 Pardaos	10,000 foot 800 horses 15 elephants	10,000 Pardaos
9. Mallpanarque, lord of the country of Avaly (Avati in the Kolar District)	15000 Pardaos	6,000 foot 400 horses	5,000 Pardaos
10. Adapanayque, lord of the country of Gate (perhaps Gutti (Gooty).	300000 Pardaos	8,000 foot 800 horses 30 elephants	40,000 Pardaos
11. Bajapanayque, lord of Mumdoguel (Mudkal)	400000 Pardaos	10,000 foot 1,000 horses 50 elephants	150000 Pardaos

But there was no interference with the details of the incidence of taxation and the mode of collection by the Central government.[27] The imperial government interfered with the local governments when there was mal-administration or oppression by the local governors. We come across one such instance in the reign of Dēva Rāya II. The country became full of disease. All people that remained either died or suffered. The king interfered and prohibited extortion.[28]

---

27. Mahalingam, Admn., p.189.
28. ARSIE, 1905, ii, para 30.

Section 4

The Nayankara System:

In the Vijayanagara empire, there were areas which were administered through feudal vessals, who claimed to enjoy a semi-independent status. They were known by different names, namely, Sāmantha, nāyaka, dandanāyaka, mandaleśvara, rāja, mahārāja, udaiyār etc. They had the same status and powers. The Nāyankara system was a grant of land by the King to a Nāyaka or Pālaiyagār on condition of military service. In the course of their conquests, the kings of Vijayanagara reinstated some of their original rājas in their ancient possessions on submitting to be triburary vassals to them as superior lords. Those who held Pālayams under these sovereigns were distinguished by the title of Pālaiyagār (Palegar).[29] The system of the administration of the empire through feudatories had developed into the nāyankara system. All the land belonged to the king and he distributed the lands to dependants, and those who held lands from the king were called nāyakas,[30] and their territory was known as amaram or nāyakkattanam. Venkataramanayya regards the Amaranāyankara as referring to a piece of territory yielding a fixed revenue granted to a military chief by the

---

29. Rice Lewis, Mysore Gazetteer I (London, 1897) p.578.
30. Mahalingam, SIP, p.320.

Rāyas of Vijayanagara.[31] They had to pay a fixed annual financial contribution to the Central government. They had to provide for the defence of the kingdom and for that purpose had to maintain a fixed number of foot-soldiers, horses and elephants, which they had to provide for the Central government in times of war. Thus the Nāyakas had to provide the king with both men and money.

Nuniz, writing about Acyuta Raya, observes: "The kingdom of Bisnaga is divided between more than two hundred captains who are all heathen........"[32] Further, he says: "All the land belongs to the King and from his hand the captains hold it."[33] Paes says that the king fixed the revenue according to the income of the Nāyakas.[34] Referring to Acyuta Rāya, Nuniz says: "This king Chitarao has foot-soldiers paid by his nobles, and they are obliged to maintain six lakhs of soldiers, that is six hundred thousand men, and twenty-four thousand horses, that is six hundred thousand men, and twenty-four thousand horses, which the same nobles are obliged to have. These nobles are like renters who hold all the land from the king, and besides keeping all these people they have to pay their cost; they also pay to him every year sixty lakhs of rents as royal dues. The lands, they say, yield a hundred and twenty lakhs of which they must pay sixty to the king, and

---

31. Venkataramanayya, Studies, op.cit., p.179.
32. Sewell, op.cit., p.370.
33. Ibid., p.360.
34. Ibid., p.270.

the rest they retain for the pay of the soldiers and the expenses of the elephants which they are obliged to maintain." 35

The relationship between the king and the Nāyaka was like that of a feudal lord and his vassal. The Nāyakas acknowledged their inferior position by mentioning their feudal overlord first in the charters and inscriptions they issued. Paes writes: "This king of Bisnaga has five kings his subjects and vassals, besides other captains and lords having large territories and great revenues; whenever a son happens to be born to this king, or a daughter, all the nobles of the kingdom offer him great presents of money and jewels of price, and so they do to him every year on the day of his birth."[36] Further, he says: "On the same day they give great gifts of money to the king, it is even said that they give on that day to the king in money a million and five hundred thousand gold Pardaos, and each Pardao is worth three hundred and sixty reis, and from this you will be able to know how many reis there will be. I wish you to know that on this day begins their year; it is their new year's day, and for this they make the feast and give the gifts."[37] Then they were present at the imperial court on occasions like the

---

35. Ibid., p.354.
36. Ibid., p.270.
37. Ibid., p.270.

birth of a son or daughter to the king or his annual birthday when they offered him presents of money. Gifts of money were made to the king on the New Year Day.

The feudal vassals were punished if they did not discharge their obligations. Nuniz observes: "During his feasts and the alms giving to his temples all these captains, who are thus like renters, must always attend the court, and of those whom the king always has about him and by whom he is accompanied in his court there are more than two hundred. These are obliged always to be present with the king, and must always maintain the full number of soldiers according to their obligations, for if he finds that they have a less number they are severely punished and their estates confiscated."[38]

In this connection, it is necessary to point out the distinction between a nāyaka and the governor of a province, usually called dandanāyaka. Both Nāyaka and the Dandanāyaka were governors of provinces. Mahalingam has pointed out that both in their constitutional and political position, they were different.[39] In the first place, the Dandanāyaka or governor represented the king in a province. He governed the province on behalf of the king. The nāyaka was essentially a military vassal. He was given an amaram or military fief

38. Ibid., p.355.
39. Mahalingam, SIP, p.323.

K. U. UNIVERSITY DHARWAR

which enabled him to discharge his financial and military obligations. Secondly, the governor was transferred from one province to another in order to prevent the creation of lesser loyalties either between themselves and the hereditary rulers or between themselves and the subjects. But ordinarily, the nāyaka who was given a particular nāyakship was not transferred from it. Thirdly, in the beginning the nāyakship was personal. But in course of time, it became hereditary due to the weakness of the central government. The emperors had granted to them permanent fiefs (amara-nāyakatana, amara-māgane etc.,). During the thirty-six years between 1529 A.D. when Krishnadēva Rāya died, and 1565 A.D. when the battle of Rakkasa-Tangadi was fought, they subverted the very empire which had heaped honours upon them and had given protection to the people and their faith.

The nāyakas appear to have maintained two sets of officers at the imperial court. One of them appears to have had charge of the army of the lord stationed at the capital. The other officer was the Sthānapati or civil agent, who looked after the interests of his master at the capital. Nuniz says: "The captains and lords of this kingdom of Bisnaga, as well as those who are at court as those who are away from it, have each one his secretary who goes to the palace in order to write to him and let him know what the king is doing, and they manage so that nothing takes place of which they do not soon know, and day and night they are always in the palace."[40]

---

40. Sewell, op.cit., p.355.

According to the Rāyavācakamu, Viśwanātha Nāyaka of Madura had an agent (Sthānapati) at Vijayanagar and he wrote the Rāyavācakamu giving an account of the reign of Krishnadēva Rāya.[41] Krishnasvami thinks that by means of these two officers, the Vijayanagara rulers controlled them in the distant provinces. They formed the link between the Central government and the provincial government on the one hand, and between the central and local organizations on the other.[42] The Central government controlled the provisional organizations through its agents as explained below.

Section 5

Control of Provincial Organizations:

The Avasarams were special agents sent throughout the various parts of the empire to undertake business of an urgent and special nature.[43] The Sāmantādhikāris[44] and mahānāyakācāryas[45] were at the head of the department dealing with feudal vassals. In the later Vijayanagara period, 'Special Commissioners' were appointed to keep the nāyaka under control.[46] For example, Rāma Rāja Viṭṭhala exercised

41. Aiyangar, S.K.: Sources, pp.110-111.
42. Krishnasvami, A.: The Tamil Country Under Vijayanagar, (Annamalainagar, 1964), p.189.
43. Mahalingam, SIP, p.331.
44. EC, IX, Dv. 29; IA, X, No.97.
45. 297 of 1926.
46. Mahalingam, SIP, p.331.

control over the far south. The Nāyaka rulers of the south were subordinate to him.[47] Thus the Daṇḍanāyakas who were the governors of provinces enjoyed a good measure of local autonomy, and the nāyakas enjoyed a semi-independent status.

Section 6

Provincial Government:

Feudal:

The Vijayanagara empire contributed to the rise of many principalities like Tanjore, Jingi, Madura, Keḷadi, Bēlūr, Mysore, Uḷḷāl, Nagire, Hāḍuvaḷḷi, etc., ruled by feudatories who enjoyed varying degrees of autonomy. Beni Prasad says, "The empire was essentially a feudal-federal structure of the ancient Hindu type."[48] This organizational structure can be explained with reference to the Nāyakas of Keḷadi and Madura.

The Nāyakas of Keḷadi:

In Karnataka, the state of Keḷadi, afterwards called Ikkēri was one of the most important principalities that owed allegience to the Vijayanagar empire in the sixteenth century.

---

47. 273 of 1902; 140 of 1895; SII, V, No.704.
48. Beni Prasad,: The State in Ancient India (Allahabad, 1928) p.470.

This feudatory family rose to power under the Vijayanagara rulers and finally became an independent state. It was in existence from about A.D.1500 to 1763, a period of nearly 250 years. At its zenith, its territories extended up to Goa in the north and Cannanore in the south, and included the present Shimoga district and a portion of Hassan district and Tuḷu-rājya.

The foundation of the state is attributed to a hidden treasure which Chauḍappa unearthed one day while ploughing a field. Both the Keḷadinṛipavijaya, a Kannada quasi-historical work in Champū style, and the Śivatattvaratnākara an encyclopaedia in Sanskrit, which also gives the history of the family state that the principality was founded by Chauḍa and Bhadra, sons of a Veerasaiva farmer, who discovered the treasure in their field near Sagar.

An inscription of A.D. 1506[49] records a grant by Chauḍappa in his own name without making reference to any paramount ruler. The Keḷadi-Nṛipa Vijaya states that Kṛishṇadēva Rāya summoned him to his court and employed the brothers against the rebellious chiefs.[50] The Śivatattvaratnākara does not mention the name of the Vijayanagara king who sent

49. MAR, 1930, No.65.
50. KNV, Canto I, Stanza 82.

for Chaudappa. They succeeded in their undertaking and the king appointed Chauda as the chief of Keladi and other places that the brothers had captured.[51]

His successor Sadāśiva-Nāyaka ruled till A.D.1565.[52] He was sent by Rāma Rāya, the de facto ruler of the Vijayanagara kingdom during the reign of Sadāśiva Rāya, in command of an army in a campaign against the rulers of Kalyāṇa and Kalburgi. (Gulbarga) whom he defeated. He also put down the Sultan of Bidar, and the rebel chiefs of Tuḷu and Kerala and Maderasa of Baṅkāpura.[53] An inscription of A.D. 1563[54] gives the extent of territory governed by him as 56 gāvudas comprising Āraga, Gutti Thirty-six Kampaṇas, Tuḷu-rājya, Bārakūru and Maṅgaḷūru. Another ruler of Keḷadi, Immaḍi-Sadāśiva in company with Rāmarāya's cousin Viṭṭhala came into conflict with the Portuguese.[55] Veṅkaṭappa-Nāyaka (A.D.1586-1629), another Keḷadi ruler, who is stated to have been ruling over Tuḷurājya and Malerājya acknowledged till A.D.1613 the suzerainty of Veṅkaṭapatidēva Mahārāyal.[56] After this, He asserted his independence from the suzerainty of of Vijayanagara.

51. N. Lakshminarayan Rao, Vijayanagara Sex Centenary Commemoration Volume (Dharwar, 1936), p.256.
52. Ibid., 257.
53. Ibid., 258.
54. 487 of 1928-29.
55. Lakshminarayana Rao, N. op.cit., p.260.
56. SII, VIII, No.297.

KARNATAK UNIVERSITY DHARWAR LIBRARY

Śivappa-nāyaka, who ruled Keḷadi from A.D.1645 to 1660 was one of the most distinguished members of the Keḷadi house. His best known military exploit which had far-reaching consequences was the capture of Vellore from the Bijapur and Golkonda forces who had taken possession of it driving out the emperor Śrīraṅgarāya.[57] Śrīraṅga, who was wandering without a home came back to Vellore and gave him many titles and honours. Ikkēri assumed the role of protecting Hindu culture after the dismemberment of the Vijayanagara empire.

Thus the Nāyakas of Keḷadi, from the time of Krishnadeva Rāya till A.D.1613, were loyal and obedient feudatories. The Italian traveller Pietro della Valle who went to Ikkēri with a Portuguese embassy from Goa testifies to this development. "This Prince Venkatapa Naiska was sometime vassal and one of the ministers of the great king of Vidianagar .... but after the downfall of the king .... Venkatapa Naiska ... remained absolute prince of the state of which he was the Governor, ... which also, being a good souldier, he hath much enlarged."[58]

Section 7

The Nāyakas of Madura:

The Nāyakas of Madura were loyal and devoted to the

---

57. Aiyangar, S.K.: Sources, p.347.
58. Sewell, R.: op.cit., p.212.

Vijayanagara rulers till about A.D.1610. There are conflicting views concerning the foundation of the Nayakaship of Madura. According to Sathianathier, it was founded during the last year of Krishnadeva Raya's reign in A.D.1529 or 1530.[59] Heras said that it was established towards the close of the reign of Achyuta Raya when Visvanatha Nayaka was the master of the kingdom of Madura.[60] According to ~~Venkata Ramanayya~~ Further Sources, the foundation took place during the period of Visvanatha Nayak's son Krishnappa Nayaka, probably after the battle of Talikota.[61] Krishnaswami suggests that the Madura Nayakship was founded during the last year of Krishnadeva Raya's reign and confirmed by his ~~son~~ father Achyutaraya.[62]

Visvanatha, a loyal feudatory of both Sadasiva Raya and Rama Raya cooperated with Rama Raya Vitthala in his wars against the Tiruvadi ruler and the Portuguese in the fishery coast.[63] Visvanatha's son and successor, Krishnappa Nayaka was also loyal to Sadasiva Raya[64] and a part of his forces was sent to help the Vijayanagara sovereign at Talikota.

---

59. Sathianathier, R.: History of the Nayaks of Madura (Madras, 1924), pp.39-47.
60. Heras, The Aravidu Dynasty of Vijayanagar (Madras, 1927) p.132.
61. Venkataramanayya: Further Sources, I. p.241.
62. Krishnaswami, A.: The Tamil Country Under Vijayanagar, p.260.
63. Sathianathier: op.cit., p.64-65, Heras, op.cit., p.168.
64. 417 of 1916, 121 of 1894.

Muttuvīrappa Nāyaka discontinued the practice of paying tribute to the Vijayanagara king during the closing years of the reign of Veṅkaṭa I. Heras is of the opinion that Muttuvīrappa rose in revolt and refused to pay tribute to Veṅkaṭa in about A.D.1610.[65] He had continued to be on good terms during the first years of his reign. A Srirangam record of A.D.1608 mentions Veṅkaṭa's authority in Madura Nāyakship.[66] A Madura inscription of A.D.1609 records that Veṅkaṭapatidēva Rāya, at the request of Muttuvīrappa Nāyaka made a gift of the village of Nāganallūru, surnamed Mudduvīra-mahīpālasamudra, on the northern bank of the Kāvēri river, to Brahmans. The Nāyak divided the village into 82 shares and distributed them to several learned Brahmans.[67] Early in 1610, his gift of land to the temple at Ambāsamudram, Tinnevelly[68] is recorded without mentioning Veṅkaṭa. Till A.D.1610 the Nāyakas of Madura were loyal to the imperial sovereign.

Thus an important feature of the Vijayanagara provincial administration was the existence of a number of feudatories who claimed to enjoy a semi-independent status and, who, in the confusion that prevailed in the seventeenth century, became independent.

---

65. Heras: Aravīdu Dynasty, p.360.
66. 49 of 1939.
67. CP. No.9 of 1906.
68. 122 of 1907

Referring to the civil institutions in the Vijayanagara empire, Nilakanta Sastri observes: "The admirable system of autonomous village rule that had been established under the Cholas and that survived intact for several generations after them, now fell into neglect, and all but disappeared in this period thanks to the pressure of military needs of the emperors and the feudatory <u>Nāyakas</u>."[69] It is difficult to subscribe to this view. Local institutions did not disappear totally under the Vijayanagara empire. They did continue in the villages and <u>agrahāras</u> with which we are concerned in the succeeding chapter.

---

69. Nilakanta Sastri:,K.A.: <u>A History of South India</u>, (Madras, Second edition, 1958) p.11.

CHAPTER III

VILLAGES AND AGRAHARAS

Section 1

Administrative Divisions:

For properly carrying on the administration of the country the kingdom was divided into a number of administrative divisions called Sīme or nādu, Sthala and Grāma. In the Tamil districts, the ancient Chōla territorial sub-divisions remained intact. It was as early as the reign of Bukka I himself that the ancient Chōḷa and Pāṇḍyan kingdoms were subdued. The old territorial sub-divisions Kōṭṭam, Nādu, Vaḷa-nādu and Maṇḍalam functioned as in the days of the Chōḷas. In the Telugu and Kannada areas, the administrative sub-divisions which were survivals of the past are also mentioned.

The village formed the unit of provincial organization. Each village formed an administrative unit. A village included one or more hamlets in it. A few villages were grouped together to form a Sthala. The name of Sammat, later Samutu took the place of the Sthala in the later Āravīḍu period. For example, an inscription of A.D.1517 from Nanjangud taluk mentions Baḷaguḷa Sammat.[1] A Hiriyuru

1. EC, III, Nj.10.

~~A Hiriyuru~~ inscription of A.D.1533 mentions Dharmapura Sammat.[2] A few Sthalas[2a] were grouped into a Sīmā or nādu, while others[2b] have been used as equivalent to Nādu. According to Dr. Venkataramanayya, the term Sīmā was used in two different senses. In Ashtagrāma Sīme and Bāgūr Sīme it signifies a tract of land commonly regarded as a unit. In Vrittiye Sīme and Sakala Sīme it denotes an artificial group of villages created by the government with a view to administrative convenience.[3] The territorial sub-division which corresponded to the Kannada nādu in the Telugu country was the Sīmā. For example, Gaṇḍikōṭa Sīme, Chongalamarri Sīmā, Koṇḍaviṭi Sīmā.

Between the nādu or Sīmā and the rājya we find another intermediary sub-division called valita.[4] Many Kannada inscriptions refer to the Vēnthoya or Vēnthe, which is etymologically connected with Valita.[5] It appears to be higher than the Sthala and lower than the rājya. For example, inscriptions give a list of the nādus in Hastinavati Valita. An inscription of A.D.1554 from Rāgulapādu, Gooty Taluk, mentions Muda-nāḍu in Hastināvati Valita.[6] Another inscription at Timmacherla in Gooty Taluk, mentions Gutti Valita.[7] Similarly three provinces of the empire, Udayagiri, Penugoṇḍa and Hampi were divided at the first instance into

---

2. EC, XI, Hr.36. 2a Venkataramanayya Studies p 147, Mahalingam, Admn, p 182, SIP p 308
3. Venkataramanayya, Studies, p.147.
4. Ibid., 2b. [illegible]
5. EC, III, NJ.35; EC, XII CK 6 and CK 10.
6. SII, IX, ii, No.653.
7. Ibid., No.427.

various Velitas.

Of the administrative units four stand out prominently. These are the nādu, the village, the agrahāra and the town. Their administrative bodies were the Nādu, the Ūru, the Mahāsabhā or the Sabhā and the Nagara respectively.

Autonomous villages flourished during the Chōḷa and Chālukyan epochs. They did not totally disappear under the Vijayanagara empire. In spite of the strong centralised government of the empire, we find evidence of their existence and their functions. The Vijayanagara monarchs did not introduce measures by which the powers of the local bodies would lapse to the Central government.

Section 2

Village Administration:

Village administration in South India was characterised by a remarkable spirit of cooperation among the people. The nature and powers of the local units had been shaped already in early Tamil and Karnataka times. A study of the main features of village administration in the pre-Vijayanagara period will serve as a back-ground to its understanding in the Vijayanagara period.

In this connection, Mahalingam observes, "these village communities were each an organism born out of the consciousness of the members of a kinship among them.

Their growth was gradual and spontaneous and the communities adapting themselves to changing conditions inthe country."[8]

In the Tamil land, in the pre-Vijayanagara period, the village assemblies enjoyed considerable autonomy in revenue and judicial matters. They had reached their highest watermark during the political supremacy of the Cholas between the ninth and thirteenth centuries. About the ninth century A.D. there were three kinds of village assemblies in Southern India. One of these was composed entirely of Brahmans, the Mahāsabhā or Sabhā in agrahāras. The Uttaramallur inscriptions of the time of Parāntaka I give details of the membership of the brahmadēya or Brahman villages. ~~Secondly, those that~~ The other two kinds were made up of cultivators, merchants and ~~thirdly, of~~ men belonging to other professions. This kind of assembly which existed side by side with Brahman organizations was called Ūr and nagarattōm. As regards rules concerning membership of these two types of assemblies, it is observed thus: "It is not unlikely that all the conditions pertaining to membership in the Brahmanical Sabhās prevalied, except perhaps the knowledge of the Vedas." [9]

In the Andhra area also in the pre-Vijayanagara period, the village community was a compact one. The affairs of the

---

8. Mahalingam, SIP, p.335.
9. Saletore, Soc. & Pol. Life, I, p.333.

village were managed by the villagers themselves. The village was also an economically independent unit.[10]

Both the secular and religious aspects of the community organizations in Karnataka are discussed in '<u>Local Self-Government in Mediaeval Karnataka</u>' a work which covers the period from the end of the tenth to the beginning of the fourteenth century A.D. It seeks to enquire how the people governed themselves in this area during this period by means of their assemblies in villages and towns and in sub-divisions or groups of villages and towns.[11] One is impressed by the display of cooperative spirit and interest in public affairs in rural and urban centres of communal life.

In Karnataka, the lowest territorial units were the village, the <u>agrahāra</u> and the town with three kinds of assemblies, the <u>Ūru</u>, the <u>Mahājanas</u> and the <u>nagara</u> respectively. The <u>gāuṇḍa</u> or headman was the pivot of the village administration. The accountant was called <u>Sēnabōva</u> or <u>Kulakaraṇi</u>. Then there were the twelve <u>āyagārs</u> or village servants. These were the ~~headman, accountant and~~ <u>talaṛi</u>, the boatman, the <u>barika</u> or watchman, the <u>tōtiga</u> or inferior village servant, the stone-mason, the blacksmith, the goldsmith, the carpenter, the barber and the astrologer etc.[12] The rural organizations,

---

10. Somasekhara Sarma, M.: <u>History of the Reddi Kingdoms</u>, (A.D.1325-A.D.1445) (Waltair, 1948), p.223.

11. Dikshit, G.S.: <u>Local Self-government in Mediaeval Karnataka</u> (Dharwar, 1964), p.1.

12. <u>Ibid</u>., p.67.

namely the Sabhā, the Ūru and the Nādu performed several communal functions such as the collection of various taxes and the administration of the income.

Village assemblies survived under the Vijayanagar sovereigns. The Vijayanagara rulers claimed to be promoters of ancient constitutional usage which was confirmed in a dharma-śāsana. According to an inscription of A.D.1565 from Channagiri in Shimoga District, during the reign of Rāma Dēva Mahārāya, "the Agent for his affairs, promoter of the Puvalavaṁśa, Hanumi Nāyaka's sons Billappa Nāyaka and Keṅgappa Nāyaka, caused to be written and given to Lingana a dharma-śāsana as follows: You having stated that - 'we are old residents, and preserving the places obtained by our ancestors, have been your dependents, the offices of Sēnabōva, jyōtisha, of the country since brought under Sist should be granted to us, and the former residents affirming that the offices of Sēnabōva and jyōtisha, purōhita and others in all the villages belonging to the Sante-Bennur-Sime in the Uchchangi-(v)enthe, were held by you, we therefore grant them to you, as a gift to Rāma, to be enjoyed by you, your sons, grandsons, and posterity in regular succession; and you may take possession of the dues and rights belonging there in the Sante-Bennur-Sime", according to ancient constitutional usage.[13] .If the claims of the Vijayanagara rulers to be

---

13. EC, VII, Ci.62.

promoters of ancient constitutional usage (pūrvamariyādevalli) are granted, obviously a good deal of the village activities of the pre-Vijayanagara period must have continued.

In this connection reference may be made to two epigraphs which mention the amount of money spent on founding certain villages. An inscription from Pavugada in Tumkur District of about A.D.1394 records that Vaddi Hanumana-bōyiḍu and others (named) sent for the sixty families of their kinsmen, founded three villages, made a tank and planted gardens near Homagunḍa. The epigraph states that the money spent on this and other temples was 1150 Rāma tenkivaraha, 1160 puttali kāsu, 3150 Varaha. Then they sent for the rulers and officials of the surrounding countries and brought there Murugala Muttappa, the family guru. Tirumalagauḍa went to Penugonḍa and brought Tirumalāchārya and consecrated the villages, namely, Nallarupaṭna, Wasinayana-benḍlu and Nāgapuripaṭna which was also called Nāgalāpuram.[14] We learn from an epigraph from Gundlupet in Mysore District that in about A.D.1454, Dēva Rāya and Cunḍama Rāya, the seven sons and others went to a place, where, in the midst of a large assemblage they founded the village named Kurudi. The money spent on the village was 10,080 Rāma tenkivarahas, 2000 Lakshmīpati Varahas and 10050 Puttalikāsu.[15]

---

14. EC, XII, p.72.
15. EC, X, Gd.22.

Section 3

Kinds of the Village Assembly in the Vijayanagara period:

Bigger Assemblies in the Villages

There are inscriptional references to bigger assemblies in which all the people participated. According to an inscription at Singanallur village in Coimbatore Taluk in A.D. 1408, an agreement was entered into between the Gaudas, Settis, Brahamacharis, Brahmans, Senabovas and the Eighteen Samayas of Bandiyahalli-Modeyahalli. This is obviously a reference to a bigger assembly in which all the people of the place took part in the agreement.[16] In A.D.1556, under the order of the Mahamandalesvara Ramraja Tirumalarajyadeva-Mahaarasu, the Mahanayakacharya Timmana Nayaka of Nidugal, the Gaudas and Senabovas of Nidugalla-Sime, together with the merchants made a gift of a village.[17] This is obviously a reference to a bigger assembly. The heads of commercial groups and corporations seemed to have formed an integral part of the village assemblies in Karnataka. In A.D.1664, a village assembly is said to have been composed of gavudas, senabovas, settis and pattanasvamis of Agali, Maduvidi, Rantavalalu, Harati, Hulikunta, Muruvagilu, Sivara,

---

16. Ibid., No.433.
17. Ibid., No.665.

Henjere and other surrounding villages.[18]

The Ūru assembly was known, apart from the Ūru by various names:- Okkalu, Praje, Halaru, Hadinentu jāti or Samaya, Janani, Jagattu and Gaonoar.

The Okkalu:

Okkalu was another name used to denote the village assembly, meaning both households and cultivators. Their permission was sought for making grants. According to an inscription at Kotesvara, a suburb of Coondapur, in A.D. 1364, during the reign of Bukkanna-vodeya when Mahāpradhāna Malliya-Dannāyaka was ruling over Bārakūra-rājya, the thirty families of the village of Chakkare and others made a gift of twelve honnus and plots of dry and wet fields (specified) for the service of the God Kōtīśvara.[19] Here the words used are Chakkareya ūru mūvattu okkalu. Their permission was taken to make the gift (Gōshti mādida dharma). It shows that the word Okkalu was also used to denote the assembly. The heads of households must have been its members. In this inscription, there is a reference to the

---

18. MAR, 1918, p.54.
19. SII, IX (ii), No.407.

Okkalu meeting at a place and the word used to denote their meeting is Goshti.

The Praje:

The usual phrase accompanying the praje is samasta, that is, all. An inscriptionof A.D. 1520 from Havinahalu-Virapura in Bellary Taluk records that the people of the village of Dondavate made a grant of land to Malesani for repairing the tank at the village. The expression used is Dondavateya gramada Samasta Prajegalu.[20] Their number is not mentioned. Most villages appear to have had an assembly representing all the inhabitants known as praje, or its equivalent, with a headman. This inference can be supported by an inscription of A.D.1436 at Mudgal (Raichur District) which mentions grāmānugrāmada gavuda prajegalu, or the headman and subjects in each village.[21]

Halaru:

The term halaru or samasta-halaru meaning the several was used for the village assembly. An inscription of A.D. 1506 at Basrur in Coondapur Taluk of the time of Vira-Narasingadeva-raya, records that Basavarasa Vodeya raised as subscription from the villagers of Badakere in Kandaura, some money. It registers a gift made by the halaru of

20. Ibid., No.538.

21. Desai, P.B. (Ed.): A Corpus of Inscriptions in the Kannada Districts of Hyderabad State, (Hyderabad, 1958), No.12.

DHARWAR

Badakere of seven Varahas got as interest from the Brahmans of the place on a certain sum outstanding on them as a loan, for the service of the God.[22] Another inscriptionof A.D.1487 refers to the halaru of Paduvakeri.[23] From these instances, it can be reasonably inferred that the inhabitants of a village were referred to as halaru or halavaru.

The Eighteen Castes:

In medieval Karnataka, we find the term hadinentu jati or Samaya (eighteen castes) used for the village assembly. An inscription from Kanakanhalli in Bangalore District, of A.D.1316, records that all the gaundas of the Hommalige and dhokka nads, along with the eighteen Samaya, gave land (specified) to Pattanasvami dhokka setti for having established a fair at Galihal.[24] In the Vijayanagara period, an inscription of A.D.1408 at Singanallur in Coimbatore Taluk to which reference was made before, records that the Eighteen Samayas of Bandiyahalli-Modeyahalli along with others reached an agreement.[25] It is clear from these instances that the eighteen Samayas acted as a representative body.

22. SII, IX(ii), No.476.
23. Ibid., No.473.
24. EC, IX, Kn.6.
25. SII, IX, ii No.433.

<u>Janani, Jagattu</u>:

Village assemblies, known as <u>janani</u> and <u>jagat</u> were in existence in South Kanara in Vijayanagara times. An inscription found in the village of Kanyana in South Kanara ~~says~~ of A.D. 1398 says that Harihara II, on his birthday, after taking the permission of the <u>jagat</u> and <u>janani</u> of that village made a grant of taxes from the village Rājādi-Kanyāna to Vallabha-devarasa.[26] The inscription registers a sale of land to a certain Lingarasa by the six <u>Jananis</u> of the Nalkuru of Rājāḍi-Kanyāna (i.e., Bellaturu) and by the fifty <u>jagat</u>, subject to certain conditions. In A.D. 1384 the Vijayanagara Viceroy <u>Mahāpradhāna</u> Jakkarasa Oḍeyar governed from Bārakūru. The epigraph registers some privileges ~~made~~ given by the <u>Jananis</u> of Rājāḍi-Bellaturu to the <u>Mahā-jagattu</u> evidently of the same locality.[27] According to another inscription of A.D.1402, at Yermal, Udipi Taluk, with the consent of the <u>Ūra Praje Jananigaḷu</u> a gift of some plots of land was made for the service of the God Janārdanadēva in Yermal.[28] The word <u>Grāma Jagattu</u> also occurs in inscriptions denoting the village assembly. An inscription of A.D.1425 at Kundesvara temple, Coondapur, of the time of Dēvarāya II, records that Narasiṁhadēva Voḍeya,

26. 359 of 1930-31.
27. 357 of 1930-31.
28. <u>SII</u>, IX, ii, No.426.

who was governing the Bārakūra-rājya restored without any loss to the revenue to the palace, the land once granted by Dēvaṇṇa-Sēnabōva of Kuḍakūr for the service of the god Kundēśvara, after making a thorough inquiry among the inhabitants of Kundāpura who had assembled at his call.[29] These inscriptions prove beyond doubt the existence of these general assemblies under Vijayanagara. As Saletore points out, these assemblies existed even earlier. Their continuation during the Vijayanagara times undoubtedly prove the close cooperation of the state with the citizens, and the corporate activities on the part of the Tuḷuvas. The Janani was a general assembly which also dealt with questions relating to land. According to Ramesh, Janani was an association of landlords.[30]

Gancaria (Gaoncar)

Goa formed part of the Vijayanagara empire, until it was occupied by Mahmud Gawan in A.D.1469. A record in the Honali taluk in the Shimoga District mentions ~~the~~ Vira Vasanta Mādhavarāya as the Gōvāpura Varādhīśvara. Thus even by A.D.1391 Goa had been brought under the sway of Vijayanagara.[31] Village assembly in Goa was called Gancaria,[32] in Portuguese records, and an account of it is given under the section of Village headmen.

29. Ibid., No.441.
30. Ramesh, K.V.: Tuluṇāḍina Itihāsa (Mysore, 1969) p.129.
31. EC, VII, Hn.71.
32. JRAS, 1900 B.H. Baden-Powell, The Villages in Goa in the Early Sixteenth Century, p.264.

Section 4:

Composition of the Village Assembly:

The village assembly was also known by the number of its members. ~~It~~ This practice was widely prevalant in the pre-Vijayanagara period in Karnataka. For example, we hear of Fifty of Balguli meaning the fifty mahājanas of Bāḷguḷi.[33] In A.D.1261, the three-hundred of Kuḍikūra assembled at Bārahakanyāpura, the King's capital, and made gifts of gold etc.[34] The numbers stood for the village assembly and probably refer to the number of families which first settled in the village. A village Sirivura (Yalisirur in Dharwar District) had the same number of aivattokkalu or fifty households in A.D.1005, and also later in A.D.1138.[35] This practice appears to have continued in the Vijayanagara period also. For example, the village assembly of Chakkare to which reference was made before, and which met in A.D.1364 had thirty okkalu. This probably refers to thirty families. It is possible that even after the new households came, settled down and joined the village assembly as members, the assembly was still known by its original name of Mūvattu Okkalu. We have also referred to the fifty jagat of Rājāḍi Kanyāna meaning the fifty families of the village.[36]

---

33. SII, IX(i), No.258.
34. 370 of 1927.
35. SII, XI (i), NO.50.
36. SII, IX, (ii) No.407; 359 of 1930-31.

Two inscriptions of Bukka II refer to the village assembly. One of them dated A.D.1405-6 records that the assembly of Tiruvandarkoyil, Pondicherry, consisted of 4000 members.[37] This was indeed a very unwieldy body for transacting business. An inscription of Mallikārjuna Dēva Mahārāya dated A.D.1459-60 records a gift for the merit of Narasiṅgarāja Uḍaiyār and mentions the great assembly (<u>Mahāsabhā</u>) of Kāvirippākkam, North Arcot District.[38] ~~It can be reasonably assumed that the assembly must have consisted of various committees with powers to dispose of matters relating to the particular branch of administration entrusted to the same.~~

<u>Section 5</u>:

<u>The Meetings of the Village Assembly</u>:

We do not know much about the place of the meeting, the members who attended it and the manner in which business was conducted. But from the available inscriptional evidence we get the impression that the village assembly functioned in an autonomous manner. Many expressions are used in the inscriptions to indicate that the meetings took place. 1) <u>Voppi</u>, for example <u>Dhārāpurada Chāvaḍiyali</u>

---

37. 217 of 1917, <u>ARSIE</u>, 1918, para 67.
38. 392 of 1905.

Voppi or having agreed in the Chāvadi or Dhārāpura.
ii) Neredu or having met.[39] iii) Kūṭa,[40] v) Kūḍi or having assembled.[41] It is also clear that discussions took place before the assembly came to a decision. A few references to their meetings may be given: (i) An agreement was entered into between the Gauḍas, Seṭṭis, Brahmachāris etc.[42] ii) Narasiṁhadēva Voḍeya while governing the Bārakūra-rājya, made a thorough enquiry among the inhabitants of Kundāpura who had assembled at his call.[43] iii) Decisions were taken sometimes in the presence of the representatives of the people. For example, the barbers of Kottūra Sīme were exempted from certain taxes. The order was made in favour of Timmōja, Bhadrōja, Koṇḍōja and other representatives.[44] The expression used in the inscription is Dēshābhāgada Nāyinderige. iv) During the reign of Sadāśiva Rāya, not capable of bearing the enhanced and numerous taxes, the people of the village Chebele had deserted it. Dalavāyi Appala-Nāyaka invited the people, and persuaded them to resettle in the village giving them some concessions.[45] v) The words Voḍambaṭṭu or decision taken collectively with the consent of the inhabitants occurs.[46] vi) Another expression used to denote a meeting

39. SII, XI (ii) No.163.
40. MAR, 1929, pp- 190-192.
41. SII, IX (ii), No.433.
42, SII, IX (ii) No.411.
43. Ibid., No.441.
44. Ibid., No.628.
45. Ibid., No.681.
46. Ibid., No.457.

of the inhabitants is Nāvu ellaru (all of us).[47] vii) Anumati was another word used to denote consent.[48]

A few examples of meetings in which all the inhabitants or the praje were present may be given. (i) In A.D. 1529 the people of the village of Doṇḍavate or Doṇḍavateya grāmada samasta prajegaḷu made a land grant.[49] (ii) In A.D.1561 during the reign of Sadāśivadēva-Mahārāya, Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Tirumalarāja Rāmarājeya Mahā-arasu made a grant with the consent of all the inhabitants including the Seṭṭipaṭṭanasvāmis. (Seṭṭipaṭṭanasvāmi muntāda samasta prajegaḷa anumatadinda).[50] (iii) Grāma jagattu[51] also denotes all the inhabitants. The expression is used in connection with the meeting of inhabitants of Kundapura.

Section 6:

Venue of the Village Assembly:

The village assembly generally met in a temple hall or some other public place. A Pudukkottai inscription on the second gopura in the Parvatagiriśvara temple at Kunnandarkovil records the meeting of a great assembly representing many smaller assemblies and local sects, for the purpose of assigning duties to the Kaḷḷa-Vēḷaikkārar

47. Ibid., No.528.
48. Ibid., No.618.
49. Ibid., No.528.
50. Ibid., No.632.
51. Ibid., No.441.

who sought refuge there and for fixing their contribution to the temple, for protecting them from all dangers.[52] Another assembly met in the precincts of the temple of god Vishnumūrthi. The words used are Vishnumūrtidēvara Sannidhiyalu.[53] An inscription of Pudukkottai of A.D. 1443-44 mentions a great assembly representing the temple authorities and the residents of Viraiyachchilai as having held its meeting in a flower garden.[54] The usual place of meeting was the village hall or Chāvadi. There are inscriptional references to such meetings. One such meeting of the Nāyakas, Gollas, Bestas, Workmen and others of Dhārāpura took place at the Chāvadi (Dhārāpurada Chāvadiyali).[55]

Section 7:

Officials of the Village:

Inscriptions refer to the officials of the village. Every village consisted of a number of servants who were remunerated for their services to the village community by mānyams, i.e., grants of tax-free lands, mēras and mirāsis (fees). They were commonly called āyagāras. Generally their number was twelve. But the exigencies of work, rural

52. Chronological list of inscriptions of the Pudukkottai State (1929), No.689.
53. SII, IX, (ii) No.457.
54. IPS, No.705.
55. SII, IX (ii) No.644.

KARNATAK UNIVERSITY DHARWAR LIBRARY

economy and the size of the village determined the number. In some of the villages the duties and functions of more than one servant were united in the same person.

The Gaudike or Headman's office appears to have been a coveted one. In the pre-Vijayanagara period in Karnataka, the Gāuṇḍa or headman was the chief executive of the village assembly, and the pivot of the village administration. Along with the assembly he had the main responsibility for the welfare of the village. The office was given either by the king or his officers or by the people of the village or the nādu to a person who distinguished himself by public service, especially in the village or villages to which he was appointed. He functioned both as a prepresentative of the people and as an agent of the government. His mainstay was the gaudagoḍage or rent-free land gifted to him. As the village magistrate he had powers to try petty criminal cases. He collected funds from the public and the government, and organized the public works.[56] The headman was also known by the designations of Reḍḍi (Maniyam) or gauḍa in the Tamil country.[57] We also come across the Gauḍa or Reḍḍi in the Andhra districts.[58] Raḍḍi or Reḍḍi, the headman of the agricultural community was generally the head of the village

56. Dikshit, op.cit., pp.59-65.
57. Krishnaswami, The Tamil Country under Vijayanagar, p.1@4.
58. Venkataramanayya, Studies, p.161.

and superintended its affairs. He was also called *grāmakūṭa*,[59] from which *gauḍa* is obviously derived.

In the Vijayanagara period, this office was acquired in different ways. Sometimes he was appointed by the ruler. A few instances may be given. (1) An inscription of the time of Bukka purports to register the conferment of the *gauḍirika* right over the village Nasana to Peda Ghodama Reddi, and enumerates the lands granted to him.[60] (2) In A.D.1486 when Narasiṅga Rāya was ruling, by order of the king, Gaṅgegauḍa was granted the *gauḍike* of He'eli, the village which he had built and other villages.[61] This is also an example of the same person holding the *gauḍike* of more than one village. (3) Rāya Veṅkaṭapati Nāyaka bestowed the *Gāuṇḍika* or the right of *Gauḍaship*, on a certain Yaraliṅgana-gauḍa over five villages in the Rāyadurga-rāshṭra.[62]

Village headmanship was sometimes conferred on an individual who founded a new village. This can be inferred from an inscription of A.D.1501. It records the construction of a new village called Rāvuttapura and the grant of the right to collect taxes on looms and houses in the village together with the remission of 20¼ *gadyāṇas* on the tax payable on the

---

59. EI, VII, p.170; V. Somasekhara Sarma : History of the Reddi Kingdoms (1325 A.D. to 1448 A.D.) (Waltair, 1948) p.219.
60. No.16 of 1925-26 (copper plate).
61. EC XII, Tm.54.
62. No.21 of 1910-11.

land belonging to the village, to Bayirana, the headman of Pura, with the consent of the Prabhus of Kudihēru and 18 kinds of people of the same place (Kudihēra Prabhugalu ashta- daśa prajegal anumatadim). This is an instance of the corporate activity of the people who approved of the establishment of a new village, granted the headmanship, and certain privileges to him.[63] Similarly in A.D.1591 Sandikami gauda and others (named) had the village Dāsapanahalli built, and the gaudike was given to them.[64] ~~Similarly~~ In A.D.1620 some gaudike seems to have been conferred, with the approval of the chief men, for constructing a canal.[65]

There is an instance in which the headmanship was conferred by a woman for public service upon two persons who shared it. The inscription records that in A.D.1464(?) the fort of Kuduti, a hamlet of Siddapur was built by Kambegauda and others, among the hundred families of the village, at an expense of 1892 Varahas. This amount was borrowed by Kambe gauda and Karegauda. It was paid off by a woman named Jirle Mallamma. She also constructed a well. Two temples were built by her. She instructed that Vannegauda of Siddapuri and Dāsegauda of Maritimmanahalli should be regarded as heads of the hundred families of the villages Siddapuri and Kuduti and that the office of gauda as well as the management and the

63. MAR, 1928, p.48.
64. EC, XII, Si.No.92.
65. EC, XI, Hr.13.

upkeep of the temples of Buta, Gōpālakrishna, Kambadaiya and Lakshmīdēvi, should be divided equally among both, and that the hundred families of the two villages and the twelve village officers should obey them.[66] This inscription also makes a reference to the Yajamān (Head) of Gundlahalli. It may be that the word Yajamān was also used for the gauda.

There are instances of there being more than one gauda in one place. In an inscription referred to earlier, the gaudike of Dasapanahalli was given to more than one person. It has been recorded in an inscription of A.D.1408 that if any family or families ran away from Bandiyahalli-Modeyahalli, the Gaudas responsible would bring them back or pay the amount due from them.[67] Similarly Chhatradahalli seems to have had more than one gāunda.[68] The father and brothers of Yelavanna of Chhatradahalli purchased the right of half gavudike, constructed a tank and a temple to the north of the village.[69]

Goa was for sometimes part of the Vijayanagara empire. It was dependent upon the trade with the Vijayanagara empire and its prosperity fell with the fall of Vijayanagara.[70] Firishta writes, "The seaport of Goa, the fortress of Malgaon (probably Madgaon), belonged to the roy of Beejanuggur, and

66. MAR, 1929, No.97, p.181.
67. SII, IX (ii) No.433.
68. Ibid., No.670.
69. 508 of 1914.
70. Sewell: op.cit., p.150.

many districts of Tulghaut (The Tuḷu-Ghat or the Tuḷu country) were in his possession.[71] One Bāchaṇṇa Uḍaiyār was governor of that place during the reign of Harihara II.[72] In A.D.1469, while either Rājaśēkhara or Virūpaksha was the king of Vijayanagara, Mahmud Gawan, captured Goa after a successful campaign, which was in the possession of the Rāya of Vijayanagara.[73] Hence in this connection, an account of the village administration of Goa, particularly the part played by the village headman will be useful to understand the nature and functions of this office.

In Goa, every village had certain 'Gancars' or village headmen. Their number varied according to the custom of the village.[74] This is clear proof of the fact that custom was respected, and secondly, some villages had more than one headman. The office was hereditary. He could not be removed from office for any reason.[75] If he committed a crime, there could be a penalty in person or goods; and if the punishment was death, the office passed on to the son or next heir. If he absconded to avoid payment of revenue, an assembly of the village called Gancaria was to be held, and a proclamation made for the fugitive. The headmen had duties to perform in connection with the revenue and cultivation.

---

71. Ibid., p.44.
72. Ibid., p.47.
73. Ibid., p.96.
74. Baden-Powell, The Villages of Goa in the Early Sixteenth Century, JRAS, 1900, p.263.
75. Ibid., p.264.

Each village was bound to pay a certain rent (or revenue). The headman assisted by the 'writer' would assign the amount among the cultivators and those having lands according to their customs and the conditions of the charter. The headman had to distribute, collect and pay the revenue or rent, whether it increased or decreased. The loss or profit would remain with them and the village, in order that the persons might bear the loss or share the profit, who by custom were entitled. They were exempted from loss occasioned by war.

Gancars could give rent-free vacant lands to the village servants, that is, the temple Brahman, the gate-keeper, the washerman, cobbler, carpenter, blacksmith, temple-sweeper, dancing girls and the 'chocarreiro' (some bailiff or other collector). They got rent-free holdings of garden or other land as remuneration for their services. The grants were irrevocable nor could any servant be removed and another put in his place. This was because the servant was hereditary and the grant was to him, his son, grandson etc. If such a grant lapsed from failure of heirs, another man of the same profession must be put to fill his place. Headmen could not make a rentfree grant to any person not resident in the village. The headmen could grant land which was waste or fallow to any applicant who desired to cultivate on condition of the payment of such rent as may seem fair. Later on, the

customary rate would be payable. Once granted, all such lands became hereditary possessions as a general rule. In case the whole village failed to pay the revenue, the headman could call the headmen of all the eight principal villages. To such an assembly the headman of the disabled village could relinquish the management. The deficit was to be made good by distributing the amount among the eight villages or over the whole island. Even then, the regular Gancars were not permanently ousted. They were to be restored whenever they asked for restitution and offered to pay the revenue demanded. Turning back to how village headmanship was acquired, we have an instance where the headman sold his gaudike. In A.D.1581, Siddaṇṇa-gauḍa of Siddapura sold the gaudike which belonged to him of Rottehalli for 2000 Varaha to Medakeri-Nāyaka.[76]

The king could give this office to anybody of his choice.[77] Thus the office was given either by the king or by his officers or by the people of the village to a person who distinguished himself by public service. If the appointment was not by the government, it had to be confirmed by the government, as the village headman functioned both as a

76. EC, XI, Cd.48.
77. SII, IX (ii) No.173.

representative of the people and as an agent of the government.

Some instances of the office of *Sthala-gauda* may be given. In Vijayanagara inscriptions, *Sthala* occurs as the term for a sub-division or a group of villages. It may be assumed that the functions of the *Sthalagauda* extended over the *Sthala* while an ordinary *gauda's* functions were confined to the village. But an inscription of A.D.1533 from Hiriyur uses the expression *Gramada Sthalada Gaudike*, and describes how the *Sthala-gaudike* of the Village was conferred. The *Mahanayakacharya* Harati Aimangala Tippala Nayakacharya granted to Vadda Irana-Bore through Balana Gauda of Kandehalli, a hamlet of the Dharmapura *Sammat*, an *inam* of one bracelet, one necklace, one small sized turban and one check suit, for having expended 250 *gadyana* and erected four towers for the Kandehalli fort; and in addition to this, enjoined the following: "And you (i.e., Balana Gauda) having come before us with the waterman (or turncock) the village servants, the *Sanabhoga* Putarangana, the watchman Voba, the *begaras* Timmo and Dase and made petition at our palace in order that the usual customs may be carried on in accordance with our orders, we have conferred on you the *Sthala gaudige* of the said village and orders are used to grant a *Sasana* to that effect .... the *Sthala gaudike* of

this Kandehalli village will be enjoyed by the posterity in succession of the family of the Nonaba Balana Gauda and so also the talavāra, the bēgāra and others.[78] According to another epigraph from the same place, the same Mahānāyakāchārya granted similar ināms to the same contractor but through Dodda Damana gauda of Sugur in Guddanād for having built four towers for the Sugur fort at a cost of 200 Varaha; and to Dodda Damana gauda, he also gave the Sthala gaudike of the village.[79] From the instances mentioned above, it can be noticed that the office was given by the king's officer to a person who distinguished himself by public service, especially in the village or villages to which he was appointed. The hereditary character of the village offices can also be inferred from the Hirivur inscriptions.

Inscriptions give us the names of other important officials of whom the Sēnabōva or Sānbhōga, a person of much consequence, was one. He was the village accountant. This was also an ancient office. A Western Chalukya grant dated A.D.1093-4 mentions it.[80] In A.D.1238 a Sēnabōva was the adhikāri of Sētu.[81] He maintained the revenue register of the village. He maintained accounts relating

---

78. EC, XI, Hr.36.
79. EC, XI, Hr.39.
80. Fleet, Indian Antiquary V, p.344.
81. EC, VIII, Nr.10.

to the extent of the arable and waste lands, cultivated and fallow land, the wet and dry cultivation, taxable and rent-free land, an estimate of the crops grown, the assessment on the dry and wet crops under the previous and the present governments, the total extent of brahmadēya and dēvadāya lands, the village services and all items concerning the administration of the village including public works. He appears to have been known also as Kulakarni or Karaṇam. The Gauḍa and the Sēnabōva were the chief officers of the village. Any business transacted on behalf of the whole village without their approval was invalid and illegal. The office of Sēnabōva was also hereditary. An epigraphical record of A.D.1565 from Channagiri is clear evidence of the hereditary character of the village officers. The offices of Sēnabōva and jyōtisha were granted to one Lingaṇṇa. The former residents affirmed that the offices of Sēnabōva jyōtisha, purōhita and others in all the villages belonging to the Sante-Bennur-Sīme were held by him. The inscription records, "We grant them to you, as a gift to Rāma, to be enjoyed by you, your sons, grandsons and posterity inregular succession and you may take possessionof all dues and rights (specified) belonging there to in the Sante-Bennur-Sīme, according to former custom."[82] The post of Sēnabōva had always been hereditary and it is argued

82. EC, VII, Cl.62.

t-307

KARNATAK UNIVERSITY DHARWAR LIBRARY

rightly that since one of the meanings of Kula is 'hereditary', Kulakarni may also mean hereditary accountant.[83] The hereditary character continued under the Vijayanagara rulers.

The Brahman purōhit was as important to the village community as the other servants of the village. From time immemorial, each member of the Hindu society was accustomed to act at auspicious moments after consulting the purōhit. The conditions of service of the village astrologer are described in an inscription at Settikere (Tumkur District) as Ūraliddu Ūligavanada[84] i.e., he could enjoy his inam lands if he lived in the town and performed his duty.

The Talāri was appointed for police purposes. His activities were supervised by the village headman under whom he had to work. He was also called the talevāre or the Kāpu or the kāval. His office was hereditary like the other village offices. His duty was to go on rounds both day and night to preserve law and order and bring the offenders and bad characters to book. ~~Every village in ancient times had a prākāra or boundary wall around it, with gates and watch towers.~~ To protect the village from wild beasts and the enemy from outside was the duty of the bāri-kāpu. His duty was restricted to external watch. Sometimes the fees

83. Dikshit, op.cit., p.66.

84. EC, XII, Ck.2.

for the kāpus were paid from the village shares. In A.D. 1525-26, Chennama Nāyanin̄gāru settled under a tank at Kaṇḍla Kuṇṭa, that three parts of the land were set apart for the Veḷamas, gods and Brahmans, and two for the kāpus who were guarding the country.[85]

The other village servants were the goldsmith, the carpenter, the blacksmith, the potters, the washerman and the barber. As already stated, exigencies of the village determined their number. The village was an economically independent unit. It supplied its residents all the necessities of life. The village community was a compact one, and, as we shall see, the villagers managed the affairs of the village.

Section 8:

Their Remuneration:

The mainstay of the village headman was the gauḍa-goḍage or rent-free inām land. The following inscriptions testify to this fact.

(1) In A.D.1416, Gōpi Nāyaka granted to Keta-gauda lands specified as Gauḍa goḍige free of all imposts.[86]

(2) In A.D.1528, we come across the grant of Kammahalli to Akkimangalu Tammappa Gauḍa as a Gauḍike-ḍandige-Umabaḷi ~~free~~

85. ARSIE, 1916, p.143; 388 of 1915.

86. EC, IX, Cp.169.

free of all imposts.[87]

(3) A record at Bommanahalli in Malvalli Taluk, records that in A.D.1542 Viranna granted as a tax-free gauda godage, with all the usual rights, the village of Bommanahalli in Dhenugur Sthala to Chika-Saviyapa.[88] In this case the grant was made without reference to the people.

(4) An epigraph of A.D.1562, at Nakkarahalu in Hadagalli Taluk records that the Adhikari of Nagarehal granted manya lands to Senabova Tirumallarasa, the Gauda, Talara and Joyisa.[89]

(5) An inscription of A.D.1694 records the gift of the village Kummarakunte, free from taxes, as an emolument for conducting the said office of gauda, with the approval of the subjects of the nadu.[90]

An inscription at Kuderu village in Chamarajanagar Taluk of A.D.1501 records that the headman was granted the right of collecting certain taxes from the village by the people. It records the construction of a new village called Ravuttapura and the grant of the right to collect taxes on looms and houses in the village together with the remission of 20¼ gadyanas on the tax payable on the land belonging to the village to Bayiranna, the headman. The grant was made with the consent of the Prabhus of Kudiheru and 18 kinds of

87. EC, X, Sd.15.
88. MAR, 1920, para 88.
89. SII, IX (ii) No.676.
90. MAR, 1926, No.95, p.85.

people (praje) of the same place. This is an instance of the corporate activity of the people who approved of the establishment of a new village, and the headman who founded the village was given certain privileges such as the right to collect certain taxes. It can be inferred from this inscription that the village headmanship was conferred also on an individual who founded a new village and further he was remunerated by being given the right to collect certain taxes.[91]

It appears that the Senabōva was paid by the Central government. An inscription of A.D.1513 from Nanjangud refers to the grant of some land to the Senabōva Siddappa by Sāḷuva-Gōvindarāju-Voḍeyar.[92] A Malvalli inscription records that in A.D.1550 Kabburagau relinquished to the god Amritēśvara the pay he received from the palace and other privileges together with the office of village accountant.[93]

An inscription of the reign of Virūpāksha I gives the information that the Kallavēlaikkārars who sought refuge with the village authorities were given the duty of guarding the village lands and the lives of the people for which they were allowed to collect from each family of the eighteen castes one paṇam annually and one ring for each marriage occasion.[94] The remuneration for guarding included fees on auspicious, and important festive occasions by these

91. MAR, 1928, No.37.
92. EC, III, Nj. No.195.
93. EC, III, Ml.67.
94. ARSIE, 1915, p.106.

living in the village. In the Tamil country, there appears to have been two kinds of village police who received fees known as Ūr-Kāval and the Pāḍi-Kāval.[95] Thus as an alternative to inam lands, they received a fee or āya, from which the name āyagar is derived. The āyagārs served as a link connecting the village folk with the government and their officials. The āyagārs were village servants rather than the servants of the government.

Section 9:

Functions of the village assembly:

The powers and privileges of these village assemblies were clear and well defined. They had already been fixed in early Tamil and Karnataka times. During the Chōḷa period the villages were the real centres of social and political life. The central feature of village organization was government by means of primary assemblies. In this connection Mahalingam observes, "These village communities were each an organism born out of the consciousness of the members of a kinship among them. Their growth was gradual and spontaneous, and the communities adapting themselves to changing conditions in the country."[96] Rural institutions in the Tamil country in the pre-Vijayanagara period rendered

95. Ibid., 1916, p.143.
96. Mahalingam, SIP, p.355.

innumerable services to the people. "They were of a varied nature such as the control and regulation of land holdings, management of irrigation works and temples, collection and remission of taxes, management of charities, serving as banks by receiving deposits of money and lending and looking to the cultivation of lands.[97] In Karnataka also, in the pre-Vijayanagara period, the village assemblies fulfilled these functions.[98] In Andhra also the villagers themselves managed the affairs of the village.[99]

It is from the various inscriptions extant that we can set forth some important functions exercised by the Ūr or Ūru, and elucidate each function with the records available. Here is a description of the sphere of their jurisdiction: "We shall not be entitled to levy any kind of tax from this village. We .... shall not be entitled to claim, at the order of the assembly, forced labour from the inhabitants of the village. (If) a crime (or) sin becomes public, the god (i.e., the temple authorities) alone shall punish the inhabitants of this village (for it). ...... If we utter the untruth that this is not (as stated above) in order to injure (the charity), we shall incur the sins, committed between the Gaṅgā and Kumari." [100]

97. Ibid., p.360.
98. Dikshit, op.cit., 79-81.
99. Somasekhara Sarma, op.cit., p.223.
100. SII, III, p.iii, p.253; SII, p.I, p.20, Majumdar, R.C. Corporate Life in Ancient India (Calcutta, 1922) p.164.

Transactions relating to village lands:

In the Vijayanagara period also, we notice that a good deal of the early activities of the village assembly continued. It possessed absolute control over the property vested in its hands, and hence could sell or acquire land for any charitable purpose or public utility. The following are a few examples of these functions of the village assembly:-

(1) Chakkare Village was situated in Barakura-rajya. It had an Uru (assembly). In A.D.1364 the thirty families of the village Chakkare and others made a gift of 12 honnus and plots of dry and wet fields (specified) for the service of the god Kotisvara.[101]

(2) An inscription at Modalli in Kollegal Taluk records that inA.D.1392, the people and the Gavudas restored the fields and houses formerly granted by Hiriya Kamparaya in Modahalli, surnamed Kamparajapura to Brahmans, and placed them in charge of the Mahajanas of the village.[102]

(3) Kundapura, situated in Barakurarajya had an assembly. In A.D.1425, the inhabitants of Kundapura or gramajagattu assembled at the instance of the officer (governor), Narasimhadeva Odeya, and restored the land, once granted by Devanna Senabova of Kudakur for the service of the god

101. SII, IX, (ii), No.407.
102. SII, IX (ii), No.421.

Kundēśvara.[103]

(4) In A.D.1429, the village Gajanur was gifted with all the rights by the gauḍas of the village Hoṅgaṇṇiyahaḷḷi for the service of food offerings and perpetual lamp for the god Divyaliṅgēśvara of the village Haradanahaḷḷi in Yennered. The expression used in the inscription is "haḷḷigrāmada Samasta Gavuḍugaḷu." [104]

(5) An epigraph records the grant of a plot of land for the service of the god .... by Nārapagavuḍa of Avati for the merit of his father in the reign of Dēva Rāya, king of Vijayanagara. The gift was made with the consent of the inhabitants of the village Kakati (Prajegaḷa anumatiyinda).[105]

(6) The Maddur assembly appears to have continued to function under the Vijayanagara rulers as before. The mahājanas and gauḍa prajegal of Maddūr granted some land and tax collections of the village Maddūr for the services of feeding pilgrims, recitation of Vedas etc., in the temple of Dēśinātha.[106]

(7) In another instance, the village assembly granted lands for the construction of a tank. In A.D.1429, all the elder gauḍas and subjects of the Ujeni village granted as

103. Ibid., No.441.
104. MAR, 1931, No.56.
105. MAR, 1926, No.78.
106. Ibid., 1928, No.56.

follows: Chēmarasa and the temple priests having provided the funds and entered into an agreement for the construction of the tank to the east of the town, and they having constructed the tank, we grant the land free of all imposts.[107]

(8) An epigraph behind the Āñjanēya temple at Kulavanhalli of Nelamangala Taluk dated A.D.1506 records a grant on the occasion of Śivarātri by the Gavuda-prajegal for the merit of Keñchasōmaṇa-nāyaka.[108]

(9) Again in A.D.1506, the gauda prajegalu of Chikkahalli made a grant of land for the God Mallikārjuna of their village.[109]

(10) An inscription of about A.D.1510 from Sira Taluk records that Tarūr Chikkanna granted land to Gujjanōḍu Parvatārādhya, with the approval of the gaudas and sēnabōva (Gauda Sēnabōvara Voppa).[110]

(11) An epigraph at Havinahalu-Virapura in Bellary taluk dated A.D.1529 records that the Samasta Prajegalu (People of the village) of Dondavate made a grant of land to Welesani for repairing the tank of the village. Samasta Prajegalu is obviously a reference to the Ūru assembly.[111]

(12) An undated epigraph near Hospet states that the Gauda, Sēnabōva and the people of Chikavedi made a gift to the

107. EC, XII, Kg.18.
108. MAR, 1914-15, para 93.
109. EC, XV, Hn.76.
110. EC, XII, Si, III.
111. SII, IX (ii), No.528.

same god.[112]

(13) An epigraph from Kadur records that in A.D.1540, the subjects and farmers made a grant to the God Vīrabhadra of Kadur.[113]

(14) According to an inscription from Molakalmuru, Taluk in Chitradurga district, in A.D.1551, all the subjects and farmers (Samasta Praje Gavuda) continued a rent-free grant to the saltmakers of Hebbar.[114]

(15) In A.D.1559, the village assembly of Chhatradahalli in Hadagalli Taluk, consisting of the Gaudas and others of the village made a gift of a field in the village for fitting up a charity water-trough with water by means of a charity water-lift.[115]

(16) We have evidence of the people of several villages acting in a concerted manner. According to an epigraph of A.D. 1573 from Hiriyur the tank to the West of Sidalayanakote, having been breached for a long time, the gaudas, Sēnabōva and subjects (gavuda Sōnabōva prajegalu) of the four boundary villages made petition to mahānāyakāchārya, Padana Nayaka, and offered to have the tank built if the land under the service were granted to them.[116]

---

112. Ibid., No.636.
113. EC, XI, Hk.71.
114. EC, XI, MK.9.
115. SII, IX (ii), No.670.
116. EC, XI, Hr.25.

(17) We have an instance in which the inhabitants sold a land under very distressing circumstances. The conditions of the people of the Ramnad district in the last days of the Sāluva usurpation do not appear to have been satisfactory. The inhabitants of Vēlangudi had no means of discharging their revenue dues to government, for as significantly stated, "it was the period of occupation by the Kannadagas (Karnatakas)." Evidently, the taxation was heavy.[117]

(18) This was also the case in other parts of the empire. The two sects of Valangai and Idangai on whom taxation weighed heavily formed themselves into a constitutional body to resist the exactions, vowing even to the extent of putting to death, those who became renegades.[118]

We have also an instance of charters of good faith or guarantee by the local officers to villagers who were ruined by the heavy taxation levied from them, and who had often had ~~revenge~~ recourse to migration from the village in order to escape the intolerable burdens. In this instance, in A.D.1527, Rāmanna Nāyaka, agent of Chinnappa Nāyaka, governor, had to state that he had not broken and would not break any of the pledges given by him at the time of bringing back the villagers of Dummi (Holalkere Taluk) who had left the village on account

117. ARSIE, 1916, p.141.
118. 92 of 1918, 216 of 1917.

KARNATAK UNIVERSITY DHARWAR LIBRARY

of the heavy dues exacted from them. Rāmanna Nāyaka, who was the Pārupatyagār of the village swore that he would not molest the villagers by exactions.[119]

Transactions relating to Revenue matters:

The village assembly performed the important function of collecting taxes and paying them to the treasury. Remission of taxes or their assignment for expenses of the temple or the imposition of fresh ones were usually communicated by the government to the assembly which made the necessary entries in the account books and carried out the orders.

(1) In A.D. 1429, for the construction of a tank, the subjects of the Ujeni village granted lands to the village priests free of all imposts.[120]

(2) An epigraph dated A.D.1561 states that Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Tirumalarāya-Rāmarājaya-Mahārasu made a grant of a fixed sum of toll-revenue of two villages (names lost) for the service of the god. The grant was made with the consent of the Seṭṭi Paṭṭaṇasvāmi and all the inhabitants of the village.[121]

(3) Two inscriptions record exemptions granted by the local bodies (Nāṭṭār and Ūravar) of Adanūr of all the taxes due from certain hamlets belonging to the temple or purchased by

119. MAR, 1939, No.16.
120. EC, XII, Kg.18.
121. SII, IX(ii), No.672.

the donors on its behalf for money received by it from the several donors under the orders of the king's officers.[122]

A few examples of exemptions of taxes communicated by the government may be given:

(1) An inscription of A.D.1544 at Narasapuram in Kalyanadurg taluk, records the exemption from taxes granted under the orders of Rāmarājayya to the barbers of Narasapura by the Mahānāyakāchārya Koṇḍama Nāyaka of Kundurpe.[123]

(2) In A.D.1547, Daḷavāyi Yallappa Nāyaka abolished biṭṭi, biraḍa and other cesses levied from the fishermen in Kasavapura.[124]

(3) In A.D.1548, Sadāśiva Rāya exempted the barbers of Maidūru (in Harpanahalli Taluk) from the payment of Kāṇike, Kaḍḍaya and other taxes.[125]

(4) In A.D.1551, Heḷavi Nāyaka exempted the shepherds of Bāguḷi (Harapanahalli taluk) and its hamlets from tax on their sheep.[126]

It can be presumed that if the local body remitted the imperial revenues without getting the permission of the central government it must have done so at its own cost.

122. 126 and 125 of 1934.
123. SII, IX (ii), No.614.
124. Ibid., No.624.
125. Ibid., No.629.
126. Ibid., No.641.

Otherwise the central government would not be prepared to accept any amount less than the terms of the contract. The local bodies guarded the interests of the community. They seem to have had considerable influence over the revenue policy of the government. The government could not impose new taxes, or remit old ones without their consent. In this connection, Mahalingam observes:

> "Usually the government fixed the assessment for the whole village, after careful survey and the assessment on individual strips or holdings was left to be settled by the local authorities. If any remission was made in the taxes payable by specified lands, it was by common consent agreed that the amount of taxes remitted on such specified lands must be made good by the other lands in the village by their agreeing to bear additional taxes to the extent necessary".[127]

These assemblies possessed certain inherent rights of fresh taxation and determining the taxes payable to the paramount authority. This is elucidated by certain epigraphs that are available. (1) An epigraph registers the decision of the assembly of Śiruvayal excluding certain ~~Sarvamanya~~ lands and including others for purposes of

127. Mahalingam, SIP, p.183.

taxation.[128] (2) Another epigraph records the gift of the right of levying certain taxes to a goldsmith by the people of Kulai-kulattūr.[129]

These village assemblies exercised the functions of a trustee, which accepted the management of charitable endowments by any private person. They accepted deposits both in kind and coin or in the shape of landed property for administering the trust on the interest derived from the deposit. In Tamilnad, in Chola times, committees of the village assembly looked after the public works like tanks and temples. A similar practice existed in Karnataka regarding the management of public works. The trustees were probably known as goshtis,[130] and individuals were put in charge of them: (1) An inscription at the village Akkamangala records that, when one Racappa, the son of a merchant Cinnappa, made a grant of a dry field of the sowing capacity of 10 Kolagas for the service of god Kallēdēva during the reign of Bukka II, the field was placed in charge of the mahājanas of the village (mahājanangalu nadasi kondu bahodu).[131] (2) An epigraph from Basrur in Coondapur taluk dated in A.D.1506, registers a gift made by the Halaru of Badakere of Varahas 7 got as interest from the Brahmans of the place on a certain sum outstanding on them as a loan for the service of the god.

128. 178 of 1926.
129. 384 of 1914.
130. EI, VII, p.201.
131. MAR, 1924, No.51.

Basavarasa Voḍeya raised the subscription from the villagers.[132] (3) In A.D.1556, Sadāśiva Rāya made a grant to the Brahmans and subjects in Nāgūr, and placed it in the hands of one Rāyappayya.[133] The village assemblies administered trusts and acted as guardians of the public endowments and charities. The donation was sometimes handed over to the trustee and the assembly supervised it as in the case of Nandikampa-Caturvēdimaṅgalam.

Judicial Functions:

The assemblies exercised certain judicial functions. We have an epigraph, the interest of which lies on the amicable settlement made by the people themselves to avoid bloody religious feuds. This was a big assembly which consisted of the Seṭṭis of Basarur and the inhabitants of Kandaura village. According to an epigraph at Basrur, in A.D.1455, an agreement was effected between the Seṭṭis of Paḍuvakēri and Mūḍakēri, two quarters in Basarūr, and the Kandaura residents regarding the boundary and the rights of their respective localities, and the paths through which the Seṭṭis of each locality had to take sheep and arecanut trees to the temple of Dēvi on occasions of festivals.[134]

132. SII, IX (ii), No.476.
133. EC, VI, Kd.165.
134. SII, IX, (ii), No.457.

There is also an instance of exchange of land between the people of two villages. In A.D.1374, all the Brahmins of Honnāvali gave to Bomma Gauḍa and other Gauḍas (named), and all the farmers and subjects of Halukur a Śāsana for an exchange as follows:- 470 poles of land in Bhagavatighaṭṭa a hamlet of Honnāvaḷi, exchanged for the same extent of land in Budanahally attached to Tulikeyahaḷḷi, a hamlet of Halukūr.[135]

The assemblies possessed also the right to confiscate the lands of guilty persons. An epigraph records a gift of two pieces of land as Tirunāmattukkāṇi to the temple of Śōḷa-Pāṇḍya-Viṇṇagar-Emberumāṉṉār at Tirupperundurai by the assembly of the village which had confiscated them from a certain Āṇḍān-Piḷḷai of Tirupputtūr on account of some default or wrong on his part.[136]

Thus these village assemblies which also functioned as courts appear to have had all the judicial and magisterial authority of the judge of a regular court. They must have decided cases of a local character with a good knowledge of the customs of the parties and the circumstances which gave rise to the litigation. In this connection, Mahalingam observes: "Besides such regular courts, there were a number

---

135. EC, V, AK.63.
136. 509 of 1925.

of irregular but popular courts which were recognised by the government and allowed to dispense justice in cases that arose within their jurisdiction. Among them were those held by the village assemblies, temple trustees, guilds and the caste elders. There was some justification for the existence of such local popular courts. In those days of lack of easy and quick means of communication in the country it could not have been possible for all people to seek justice at the hands of the regular courts which required a good knowledge of the differing local customs and practices of the people could more easily be enquired into by the men of the locality."[137]

The village assemblies exercised some control over the temples within their jurisdiction, and they enjoyed the privilege of conferring honours on individuals. For instance, the Ūravar of the villages of Kudalur and Kulamangalam conferred the title of Kalangāda-Kandan with certain temple honours on a cowherd Ponnan for supplying kids to the temple during a festive day.[138] In A.D.1390, a great number of gauḍas and others (named) made a grant of Ankeranagonto for the perpetual lamp and offerings of the god Rāmeśvara of Kuruva and Ālūr, and gave it the name of Rāmapura.[139] In A.D.1402, the assembly of Kaḷalige made a gift of some

137. Mahalingam, SIP, p.211.
138. IPS, No.692.
139. EC, VII, Hl.6.

plots of land to one Ganapanna for the service of the god Janārdanadēva at Yermmala.[140] In A.D.1551, the Nayakas, Gollas, Bedas, workmen and other of Dhārapura agreed to pay a certain sum of money for the palanquin service of the god Rāghavadēva of the village once a year.[141] More such examples will be given inthe section on Agrahāras.

Before concluding this section on village assemblies, it is necessary to refer to the opinions of learned scholars on the subject. Venkoba Rao's remarks concerning village administration in the Vijayanagara empire are as follows: "These village assemblies which were powerful local institutions during the Cola period seem to have gradually died out after the decline of the Cola empire. The few transactions noticed in the above inscription (an inscriptionof A.D.1382) were probably among the very last transactions of the assemblies before their total disappearance."[142] Again, in commenting upon an inscription of A.D.1386, he observes; "The transaction recorded in the present inscription is another late instance of the vestiges of power wielded by the village assembly."[143] The grounds for making such assertions are not clearly stated. From the inscriptional evidence given in this treatment of village assemblies, we find that

---

140. SII, IX (ii), No.426.
141. Ibid., No.644.
142. ARSIE, 1923-24, para 40.
143. Ibid., 1925-26, para 35.

village assemblies did survive during the Vijayanagara period till almost the close of the sixteenth century A.D. We have found evidence of their existence and functions. According to K.V. Subramanya Ayyar, "Under the kings of the last Vijayanagara dynasty and the dark days of what is generally called the memorable invasion of Malik Kafur as well as during the period of rule of the Bahamani line, the political and social institutions together with the official machinery of Southern India which were in existence from the earliest times had been shaken root and branch".[144] Thus Subrahmanya Ayyar shares Venkoba Rao's view concerning village assemblies in the Vijayanagara period. Nilakanta Sastri puts forward the same view when he observes, "In the villages the people seem to have lost a good deal of their initiative and came to depend more and more on the tender mercies of petty officials appointed and controlled by the central government or its representatives. The admirable system of autonomous village rule that had been established under the Colas, and that survived in tact for several generations after them, now fell into neglect and all but disappeared in this period, thanks to the pressure of military needs on the emperors and the feudatory Nayakas.[145]

---

144. Subrahmanya Ayyar, K.V.: Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekhan (Madras, 1951), p.313.

145. Nilakanta Sastri, K.A.: A History of South India, (Madras, 1958), p.11.

Mahalingam says, "though references to such territorial local institutions are available in the late Vijayanagar period these bodies appear to have lost by that time much of their vitality and capacity for initiative."[146] Venkoba Rao's view that we come across the very last transactions of the assemblies about A.D.1382 is questioned by Mahalingam who admits of the existence of local institutions even in the late Vijayanagara period. But, according to Mahalingam, "The centralised machinery of the Vijayanagar administration could not have fostered the healthy growth of the village communal institutions. The kings themselves did not aim at the destruction of the village republics, yet the way in which they controlled even the distant parts of their empire could not have encouraged the active and judicious functioning of these village institutions. Further the appointment of Āyagāra by the government stifled the free life of village republics."[147] I am in entire agreement with Mahalingam's observations about the decline of local institutions in the late Vijayanagara period.

Saletore believes that the Vijayanagara monarchs did not introduce measures by which the powers of the local bodies lapsed to the central authority. On the other hand, he is of the opinion that as "promoters of the Pūrvada-maryāde

---

146. Mahalingam, SIP, p.370.
147. Mahalingam, Admn., and Soc. Life, p.217.

(ancient constitutional usage) it was their endeavour to preserve the old order of things, and to allow the ancient officers to continue under the new government, although, as related elsewhere, they showed their discretion by placing over the local bodies officers of the central government."[148] Somasekhara Sarma is of the opinion that the system of village government turned the villages more or less into small republics."[149]

The fact that village assemblies did exist in the Vijayanagara period cannot be disputed although inscriptions containing references to the assemblies and their activities are not as numerous as during the Chola period. On the basis of the available evidence, it cannot be denied that the Vijayanagara rulers allowed the local institutions to continue and function as before. They were not without sympathy for them as promoters of Pūrvada-maryāde. But circumstances might have forced them to leave them to their fate. The introduction of the Nāyankara system in the provincial sphere resulted in the Nāyakas being more interested in collecting their revenues. But, as can be inferred from the study of the village assemblies, they did not disappear under the Vijayanagara empire. Further proof of this can be had by the existence of agrahāras to which we can now turn our attention.

---

148. Saletore, Soc. & Pol. Life, I, p.348.

149. Somasekhara Sarma, History of the Reddi Kingdoms (A.D.1325 - 1448 A.D.), p.284.

Section 10:

Agrahāras and their formation:

The agrahāra was a village assigned to learned Brahmans for their sustenance. It existed in Medieval Karnataka, Tamilnad and Andhradesa as in other parts of the country. The Brahman share-holders were known as the mahājanas. The mahājana assembly managed the affairs of the agrahāra. In the Vijayanagara times also, we have abundant evidence of their existence and corporate activity. Their various donations to the temples and other items of public welfare are clear evidence on the point. They looked after the general management and other municipal duties. The agrahāras served the purpose of small University centres managed by the mahājanas. The mahājanas were men of learning. The agrahāras were free from the encroachment of the soldiers and the tax collectors. They were supported by the kings, queens, nobles and by the rich and the poor. It has been rightly said, "the services rendered by these institutions in historical times are really marvellous and eminent."[150] The agrahāra was an autonomous institution in Vijayanagara times.

Agrahāras were formed in various ways in the Vijayanagara period. The king, or with his consent his officers

150. OJMS, XXXIII, No.1, Karmarkar, Society and Education in Mediaeval Karnataka, p.51.

created them. Either the donee was a single person, who, in his turn distributed shares to other persons, or the donor himself distributed the land among different shareholders. A few examples of the formation of such agrahāras are given below:-

1. In A.D.1345, Vīrammāji Hiriya Pemmaya Nāyaka granted to Rangānātha-bhaṭṭa's son Bhavabhūti, Jāla in Elahakkanāḍ as an agrahāra free of all imposts.[151] In this instance, the donee was a single person.

2. There were agrahāras in Yeḍenāḍ. An inscription of A.D. 1346 at Hejje, Sorab Taluk, records the gift of the village Heddase (Hejje in Sorab Taluk) by Prince Mārapa, younger brother of Harihara I. It describes the circumstances that led to the establishment of the agrahāra. The king beheld a tank, the sacred spot Heddase and the river Varadā, and made up his mind to create an agrahāra nearby. The donees, well versed in all the Vedas, came from Andhradēśa, and the agrahāra was named Sangamapura. The names of the donees and the distribution of vṛittis are given. The charter was got prepared in the presence of the principal chiefs of the province, and the leading men of the two agrahāras. Their names are given. "The mahājanas of the two great

---

151. EC, IX, Dv. No.3.

agraharas Elase and Kuppagadde in Edenad .... including the headmen (named), and the mahaprabhus among whom were the heads of villages (named), all these having assembled gave away the village Heddase in order that it might come under their guardianship though it had been previously granted by king Marapa."[152] Here the donor himself distributed the land among different shareholders. Another inscription of A.D.1368[153] from the village Banavasi in Sirsi Taluk also refers to the joint activity of the mahajanas of these two agraharas. When Mahamandalesvara Vira Bukkaraya was reigning in Hastinavatipura (Anegondi), and Madhavanka was ruling Banavase 12000, his servant Aubhalanatha (i.e., Ahobalanatha) sent word to the Gaudaprajegal in the 18 Kampanas of Gutti and held a meeting at Banavase. The meeting was attended by the chief citizens of Yedonad comprising the mahajanas of the agraharas of Yelase and Kuppagadde, Tammagauda of Sorab, the chief citizens (names given) of villages of Tavanidhi, Kesalur, Hechchita in Kondavatinad, Baleyahalli, Kuppatur in Nagarakhanda and Hurule. The meeting was called for conducting the services, personal decorations and festivals of the god in the temple for ever, applied for help to the gaudapraje (village headmen) of 18 Kampanas (divisions) of

---

152. MAR, 1929, No.90.
153. Ibid., No.113.

Gutti. The nature of the grant made by those assembled is not clear, but some land seems to have been given.

(3) In A.D.1359,[154] Deva Raya II granted the village Kannenahalli near Devabetta situated to the south of Hagaharya in Hagaharya-Sthala of the Rayadurga kingdom, giving it another name Pratapadevarajendrapura, to Lakshmidhararya, the knower of the purport of the Veda, Vedanta and all sciences, proficient in grammar, logic and philosophy etc. The donee formed the village into 160 vrittis or shares, retained 30 for himself and bestowed the remaining on learned Brahmans. This is an instance of a single person being the donee, who, in his turn distributed shares to other persons.

(4) In A.D.1364, Madarase of Mangaluru, under the orders of the king Vira-Bukkanna-Vodeyar, made a gift of the village Pudu-grama to certain Brahmans free of all taxes.[155] Here the donor himself distributed the shares.

(5) In another instance,[156] the donees were Kasmir Brahmans. A Shikaripur taluk inscription relates how in A.D.1368 Bukka's minister Madhava established an agrahara. He petitioned the king, saying, "From the funds of my own property I will

154. MAR, 1921, pp.29-30, para 62.
155. SII, IX, ii, No.408.
156. EC, VII, SK. No.281.

carry out your order; give me leave". After obtaining his permission, he purchased at the price of the day, Muchchuṇḍi, Palasapaḷḷi and Tēvaṭṭa, situated in Nāgarakhaṇḍa and gave them the name of Vidyēśvarapura. He summoned to an assembly learned Kaśmīr Brahmans, formed eighty shares, and bestowed them. We have also the sale deed of the villages above purchased in another inscription.[157]

(6) An inscription of A.D.1377 from Bachahalli, in Krishnarajpet taluk, records, that Harihara II made a grant with all the rights of possession, Bācheyahaḷḷi village, with its 13 hamlets (named) belonging to the Kabahu district in the Hosaṇa country, and of the village Daṇḍemaṭigaṭṭa with its 3 hamlets (named), and forming them into an agrahāra under the name of Immaḍi-Bukka-rājapura and dividing it into 60 vṛittis bestowed the latter on various Brahmans.[158]

(7) The Satyamangalam plates of Dēva Rāya II records that in A.D.1424, he bestowed on eight Brahmans the agrahāra of Chiteyatpura, which he named Dēva Rāyapura after himself.[159]

(8) In A.D.1474, king Virūpāksha made over the grant of Prasanna Channakēśavapura to Kṛishṇa Bhaṭṭa, who distributed the forty shares of that agrahāra to the mahājanas.[160] In this instance, the grant was made to a single person who

157. Ibid., No.282.
158. MAR, 1914-15, pp.57-58, para 88; EC, IV, Yd. No.46.
159. EI, III, No.5.
160. EC, III, Ml. No.121.

distributed shares to others.

(9) In A.D.1495, the royal treasurer Dēvappa Nāyaka's son Balanātha granted Narasambu agrahāra to Rāya Nañjinātha Dīkshita's son Narasimha Dīkshita.[161] Here the donee was a single person.

(10) An epigraph of A.D.1511[162] from Hampadevanahalli, Hospet Taluk, records the gift of the village, Hampadevana-halli, surnamed Krishnarāyapura to various Brahmans. Here the king Krishnadēva Rāya himself distributed the vritti after establishing the agrahāra.

(11) According to an inscription of A.D.1512 from Dodda-Jataka in Nagamangala Taluk, Krishnadēva Rāya granted the village Hiri-Jattiga, with its four hamlets surnamed Chinnadēvipura to Śrīnivāsādhvari. He having set apart 10 vrittis for himself, bestowed the remaining 20 vrittis on worthy Brahmans.[163]

(12) In A.D.1513, Krishnadēva Rāya, on the application of the minister Tippasōma granted to Viśvēśvara the village named Bhandavipalli.[164]

(13) InA.D.1516, Krishnadēva Rāya granted three villages, namely, Chikkabbehalli together with its three hamlets

161. EC, X, Gd. No.78.
162. SII, IX (ii), No.484.
163. MAR, 1914-15, para 92; EC, V, Bl. No.79.
164. EC, VII, Sh. No.1.

situated in the Nāgamangala kingdom, Halavumarahosahalli situated in the Chennapattana kingdom and Vengenahalli in the Billagondanahalli kingdom, to the virtuous ascetic, Vyāsatīrtha.[165]

(14) In A.D.1519, minister Sāluva-Gōvinda Rāja made a grant of Mādhavapura in the Umattūr-Sīme as an *agrahāra* to Nañjayarasu.[166]

(15) In A.D.1530, Achyuta Rāya granted to Venkatésvara-Varayajva, in the Hosakōta-Sīme, Sambapura as an *agrahāra*, giving it the new name Achyutamahārāyambudhi. Accepting the proprietorship of the *agrahāra*, he formed it into 24 shares which he bestowed upon the *mahājanas*.[167]

(16) In A.D.1584, Śrī-Ranga-Rāja granted to Tirumala Penugonda ..... the Upparahalli village as an *agrahāra*.[168]

(17) In A.D.1589, Tirumala Rāya's sons Rāma-Rājaiyya and Tirumala-Rājaiyya made a grant of the village of Kabbare belonging to Maddūr to two Brahmans as an *agrahāra*.[169]

(18) In A.D.1592, Venkata-Dēva-Mahārāya granted to Penugonda Tātāchārya the Maruganikunta village as an *agrahāra*.[170]

---

165. *MAR*, 1919, para 90.
166. *EC*, III, Tn. No.73.
167. *EC*, IX, Db, No.30.
168. *EC*, X, Gd. No.25.
169. *EC*, X, Md. No.25.
170. *EC*, X, Bp. No.38.

We come across the creation of agrahāras "for the merit of the monarch". A few examples may be given of such agrahāras.

(1) Nārāyaṇa-Dēv-Oḍeyar, son of Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Mallapo-oḍeyar, in A.D.1397, for the long life, health and wealth of his father (that is, uncle) Harihara-mahārāya, established an agrahāra named Pratāpa-Hariharapura at the village of Koḷatūr belonging to Channapaṭṭaṇa, and dividing it into 36 shares, bestowed them upon the Brahmans.[171]

(2) In A.D.1495, the mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Gode-Rāya made, to the sons of Timmarasa, the temple priest and others (named) a grant of the Gangadihaḷḷi village in Kukkala-nāḍu belonging to his Nāyakship. He gave it another name Timmaṇṇarājapura, as an agrahāra in order that merit might be to Immaḍi Narasiṅga-Rāya-Mahārāya.[172]

(3) According to a Magadi taluk inscription in A.D.1520, Śāḷuva-Timmarasaya, granted for the merit of Krishṇadēva Rāya, Nāgiseṭṭihaḷḷi to his ārādhya Tātaya's wife Nalladayamma in sole possession, as an agrahāra.[173]

(4) An epigraph from T. Narasipur taluk records that in A.D.1521, minister Sāḷuva-Gōvinda-Rāja, in order that merit might accrue to Kṛishṇa-Rāya, named the village of Kalsuru as

171. EC, III, Tn.64.
172. EC, IX, Bn.123.
173. EC, IX, Ma.11.

Krishnapura, divided it into 37 shares, and presented them to Brahmans.[174]

(5) In A.D.1612, Chama-Raj-odeyar of Maisur had sent a petition to Venkatapati-Deva-maharaya saying that he wished to establish an *agrahara*, and Venkatapati-Raya had expressed his strong approval. Chamaraja-Odeyar, in order that a crore of his race might permanently attain to *Vaikuntha*, united into one, the two villages of Navilur and Aladur, and giving it another name of Chamarajasamudra, divided into 41 shares, of which one share was given to the god, the remaining 40 shares being distributed among 33 Brahmans.[175]

Village and *nadu* assemblies also established *agraharas*. An inscription of A.D.1379 from Jodi-Lakkondanahalli records that the *gauda-prajegal* of Hullur were associated with the establishment of an *agrahara* Lakkagondanahalli *alias* Ramachandra-samudra.[176] In A.D.1408, all the farmers and subjects of the Araga Eighteen *Kampana*, and those of the three cities agreeing among themselves, established the *agrahara* Nagasamundra.[177] We have examples of *nadu* assembly creating *agraharas* to which reference will be made in a subsequent chapter dealing with the *nadu* assembly.

There is also an instance of the formation of an *agrahara* by dancing girls. An inscription of A.D.1599

174. *EC*, III, Tn.42.
175. *EC*, III, Tn.62.
176. *MAR*, 1919, para 86.
177. *EC*, VIII, Tl.222.

from Kunigal realtes, that Sringaremma of the Elahankanad Prabhu Immadi Hiri Kempaya gauda's state dancing-saloon (Pattada-nataka-sale), founded Śrinagarasagara agrahara.[178] Pattada-nataka-sale refers to the dancing hall.

Sometimes a village appears to have been founded by the mahajanas by reclaiming the forests. For example, an inscription at Rajabavenahalli Taluk, Bellary District records that in A.D.1419, the mahajanas headed by Hariyanna were granted the village of Hariyasamudra for having founded it by reclaiming the forests, and constructed a tank. The land, under the tank was made free from certain taxes.[179] In another instance, the Brahmans agreed to spend money to restore a dam which had been breached, and consequently were granted an agrahara. In A.D.1416, the Arali dam breached. Several Brahmans agreed to expend money and restore the dam so as to form a tank and build there a village named Muluvayi-Nachipura. They were granted the tract of land in which they might cut down the jungle and form fields. It was divided into four parts. One part was given to the temple, and the remaining three parts were to form an agrahara.[180] In this case the temple priests of Muluvayi Nachi-devi agreeing among themselves made the grant. Obviously the land belonged to the temple priests. Muluvayi Chavadi consisted of eleven villages.

178. EC, XII, Kg.29.
179. SII, IX (ii), No.440.
180. EC, X, Mb.7.

During the Vijayanagara times, not only were new agrahāras established, but also many old ones which had gone to ruin were revived. (1) An inscription of A.D. 1346 to which reference was made earlier gives the circumstances leading to the establishment of the agrahāra of Heddase (Hejje in Sorab taluk) by prince Mārapa, younger brother of Harihara I.[181]

(2) In A.D.1577 Keḷadi Rāma-Rāja-Nāyaka finding that the agrahāra of Heddase in Eḍenāḍ had gone to ruin and various people who had no right to it were in the enjoyment of their estate, took it from them, and granted the land for a satra for feeding daily ten Brahmans.[182] The history of this agrahāra shows how the Vijayanagara and the Keḷadi rulers were followers of Pūrvamaryāde.

(3) In another instance, we come across not only the revival of an agrahāra, but also incidentally, its history, during the time of Keḷadi Sadāśiva-Nāyaka (A.D.1513 - 1546) and Rāma-Rāja Nāyaka (A.D.1572 - A.D.1583). Sadāśiva Nāyaka's minister Mādappayya established to the east of the Virupa Samudra tank of Āraga, on the bank of the Kushavati river, in the name of Sadāśiva Nāyaka, an agrahāra named Sadāśivapura. During the time of Rāma-Rāja-Nāyaka in A.D.1577, it was found

181. MAR, 1929, No.90.
182. EC, VIII, Sb.475.

that the property of the agrahara was insufficient for the Brahmans and their families. Secondly, Madappa's sons had disposed of the vrittis, and having no wish for the management of the village had left it without any manager, and it was going to ruin. In the meanwhile, among the agraharas formerly granted by the king, the Yegimalali village had escheated to the palace. So Rama-Raja-Nayaka made inquiry into the case of the village, removed the original irregularities, brought into use the shares unlawfully formed into extra vrittis, and making grants of lands belonging to the agrahara which had been ruined and resumed to the palace, appointed as manager Krishnappaya, and making it the chief agrahara among those of the Araga-Gutti kingdom, gave the name of Yejamana Sadasivapura.[183]

(4) We have the history of two other agraharas of Sringapura and Vidyaranyapura. Harihara had established the two agraharas, and forming 250 shares made them over to Vidyaranya-Bharatisvami for the worship of the gods, Mallikarjuna, Vidyasankarasvami and Saradamma in the matha. In course of time all the shares had become dispersed, and the common people themselves were in possession. They had made areca plantations, gained large profits, and mortgaged and sold them to one another, without as was due, making over

183. EC, VIII, Tl.5.

the money to the *matha*, *agrahāra* and temples. Keladi Śivappa-Nāyaka (A.D.1646 - A.D.1661) in A.D.1658, inquiring into the whole matter, put them down and made over the lands to them. He apportioned the money according to the 250 shares formerly fixed for Śringāpura and Vidyāraṇyapura[184] and also for the *matha*, *agrahāra* and temples.

Section 11:

Officers of the Agrahāra:

Māsaveggades or monthly headmen:

The system of *māsaveggade* or monthly headmen, which corresponded to the *gāunda* or the headman in a village, appears to have been in existence in some parts of Mysore and Mandya districts in the beginning of the fourteenth century. The *māsaveggades* held their offices in the *agrahāras* by monthly rotation. In A.D.1327, the Brahmans of Maddūr, made a grant to five persons during the months' headship of the *Tantra-mantra-chintāmani*, the Śravaṇappāchārya Vighneśvara Dīkshitōpādhyāya.[185] Another inscription of the same place, of A.D.1328 gives the term for the month's headship which is missing in the former inscription. In A.D.1328, all the Brahmans of the all-honoured great *agrahāra* Upēndrapura, during the month's headship (*māsa-*

---

184. *EC*, VI, Sg.11.
185. *EC*, IV, Yl.40.

veggade tanadalu) of Asama Dēva, made a grant to six persons for the purpose of building Upēndrapaṭṭaṇa a-new in the dry fields of Chiraduvu.[186] Further, in A.D.1336, all the Brahmans of the same agrahāra, during the month's headship of Karatti of Udugundūr, gave a stone charter to one Mambōja.[187] Saletore observes, "We may not be far wrong in assuming that the custom of holding office by monthly rotation, atleast so far as Upendrapura alias Maddur was concerned, must also have been invogue in Vijayanagara times."[188] In the absence of more examples from Vijayanagara times, we cannot generalise about this institution. It can be reasonably presumed that this custom prevailed in Upēndrapura. The advantage of this system was that it would get the cooperation of all the members of the group.

Buddhivantaru:

The term buddhivantaru is commonly used in the inscriptions of the area covered by the present Koppa, Mudegere, Tirthahalli and Nagar Taluks. For example, in A.D.1439, Bairappa-heggade purchased a paddy land and granted it to the god, and the grant was executed by the Prabhugaḷu and buddhivantaru.[189] (Namma chāvadiya buddhivantaru). Again,

186. Ibid., 39.
187. Ibid., 38.
188. Saletore, Soc. & Pol. Life, II, p.141.
189. MAR, 1934, No.21.

an inscription of A.D.1573 belonging to the matha at Hariharapura of the Smartha sect of Brahmans refers to the term buddhivantaru. It mentions four important personages of different places who were contemporaries - namely, Śrīraṅgarāya I, king of Vijayanagara, the chief of Kārakaḷa, Narasiṁhabhārati, the Pontiff of Śriṅgeri (A.D.1563 - A.D.1576) and Mādhavasarasvati, the ascetic head of the Hariharapur matha. It is recorded that a disciple of this guru paid the value of 78 Varahas to the matha and purchased lands which were subsequently handed over for service inthe Narasimha temple at Hariharapura. The witnesses for this transaction were the mahājanas of Hariharapura, the buddhivantaru in the service of the king of Kārakaḷa, Timmaya-Sēnabhova of Beltore and the inhabitants of the nāḍu.[191] Buddhivantaru were the wisemen of the locality. ~~They were probably the agents or the officers of the locality who acted as advisers.~~

Grāmahebbāruva, hebbārvakkalu, hebbār, prabhu, odeya:

The Grāmahebbāruva was the chief of the Brahmans. The mahājanas were known as Hebbāruvas (Hebbāruvaru). For example, in A.D.1370, Virūpaṇṇa-Voḍeyar made a grant to the Brahmans of the Brahmapuri of the god Kalasanātha.

---

191. MAR, 1932, No.40; Ibid., 1916, p.62.

In order that the Brahmans should conduct the anointing, prayers and other ceremonies he granted 13 shares to the Hebbārs (hebbāruvagaḷu).[192] In A.D.1468 one Yaduvaṇṇa was the hebbār of the village Harehu.[193] Another inscription dated A.D.1494 records a grant of money which was invested in land from the income of which a Brahman was to be fed during Rudrapūje in the temple of Kaḷasanātha. The money was paid in the presence of the grāma hebbāruva or chief of the Brahmans in the village.[194] There were Hebbāruvas in Māvinakēri, Hosakēri and Gulakēri which were obviously streets or parts in Kaḷasa. This is in addition to the Brahmapuri of the Brahmans.[195] In A.D.1524, Bhayirarasa-Voḍeyar made a grant for the god Kaḷasanātha in the presence among others of the hebbār families of the Kēris or streets mentioned above.[196] In A.D.1573, a certain Siṅgaṇa was the hebbāruva of Śāntigrāma.[197] It is clear from another inscription that there was the office of hebbār. An inscription of A.D.1661 records the gift of the village Bharatavaḷḷi (Belur territory) by Śrīraṅgarāya to one Śaṅkara. He divided it into 13 vṛittis. It also records the gift by the same Śaṅkara of a plot of wetland to Śaṅkaraiya to be enjoyed by him as prabhu-mānya as an emolument for the office of hebbār

---

192. EC, VI, Mg.57.
193. EC, III, Sr.139.
194. MAR, 1934, No.18.
195. EC, VI, Mg.57.
196. EC, VI, Mg.62.
197. EC, V, Hn.117.

(chief of Brahmans) in Kanalūr district.[198] From this inscription two inferences may be drawn. Firstly, there was the office of hebbār in the agrahāras of this area. Secondly, the emolument for the office was a mānya or rent-free land. An inscription of A.D.1498 records the gift of some lands made by a woman for the service of food offering to the god Kaḷasanātha. The grant was made in the presence of the hebbāravakkalu of the village and also the hebbārvar of Hiriyamakkiya Manaki.[199] Hebbārvakkalu may mean hebbārs who were tenants (or who held tenancies) in the village or may merely mean the tenants of the hebbārs. Other terms used to denote the chief of the village were mahāprabhu and heggaḍe. In A.D.1405, the mahā-prabhus of the 59 agrahāras of the Sātaḷige Thousand in the Āraga-Veṇṭe, and all the nāḍu Brahmans agreeing among themselves granted a śāsana.[200] In A.D.1416, Bomma-dēva-heggaḍe and the Brahmans of Harandur made a grant of lands to Ahōbhali-bhaṭṭa.[201] Similarly, in A.D.1418, all the Brahmans of Chidiravali, Hārikāra Bommana-heggaḍe and others, made a grant of lands.[202] Another inscription of the 16th century registers the fixing of certain dues or taxes to be collected during the annual fair held, in honour of the god Śiva Gangādharadēvaru at Śivagange with the consent ofthe Prabhu gavuḍas, heggaḍes, etc,

198. MAR, 1926, No.5.
199. MAR, 1934, No.18, Second grant.
200. EC, VIII, Tl.22.
201. EC, VI, Sg.29.
202. EC, VI, Sg.33.

of the district of Śivagañge.[203] The term odeyaru is also used to denote the head of the agrahāra.[204] A term used to indicate the elders in an agrahāra was mūligaru. An inscription of A.D.1515 refers to the three hebbārs of the Kaḷasa Thousand village as mūligaru. Evidently, they were the three elders or leaders of the Brahmans there.[205] The āyagārs who worked in villages, presumably worked in the agrahāras also.

It is interesting to observe a special feature of the agrahāras under Vijayanagara kings. In spite of the autonomy given to the Brahmans which will be discussed later, it appears that the state imposed its own officials over the agrahāras. In A.D.1376 Harihara appointed as manager of the agrahāra Bukkarājapura, Dēvēśvara Paṇḍit.[206] In A.D.1517, Annamagasa-hebbār of Baḷegula was appointed manager to the two agrahāra villages of Purā.[207] An inscription of A.D.1532 records that, at the time of setting up the god Yōga Nṛsiṁha in the Durggāgrahāra, Rāmayya, son of Hara Mallayya, of Piḍave in the Advāni country, the seal bearer of Mallarasa-ayya, the head minister of Siṅgappa Nāyaka held the pārupatya (managership) of Durggāgrahāra, caused the sacred spot to be excavated and restored.[208] Similarly, in A.D.1577, when there was

203. MAR, 1935, No.3.
204. EC, IV, Cu.2.
205. EC, V, Mg.88.
206. EC, IV, Yd.46.
207. EC, III, Nj.10.
208. EC, IV, Yl.45.

disorder in the agrahāra of Sadāśivapura, Rāma Rāya Nāyaka, having inquired into the disorders, made new grants and appointed as manager Krishṇappayya son of Nārāyaṇappa of the treasury of the gold.[209]

We have seen that, sometimes the proprietor who was granted an agrahāra, divided it into vṛittis (shares) and distributed them among other Brahmans. In such cases, sometimes, the proprietor appointed himself as manager of the agrahāra. For example, in A.D.1370, Bukka Rāya gave to Sōma who was versed in the meaning of the 18 Purāṇas, and a poet in eight languages, Bukkarāyapura on the bank of the Pinākinī, in the Guttidurga kingdom. The donee made it into 110 shares, and keeping 36 for himself as manager, gave the rest to Brahmans.[210]

Section 12:

The Mahājana Assembly:

The administration of agrahāra villages was managed by an assembly consisting of the mahājanas. There were two kinds of meetings. In the first kind, the householders were the members of the assembly. They were the regular members. The strength of the assembly varied from place to place depending upon the number of donees who received the

209. EC, VIII, Tl.5.
210. EC, X, Gd.46.

grants. A few examples may be given:-

(1) There were 45 *mahājanas* in Tīrthahaḷḷi in Shimoga District who agreed to make a grant in A.D.1378.[211]

(2) In A.D.1380, there were 108 *mahājanas* in the Sarvajña-Vishṇupura (Homma) in Chamarajanagar taluk. They made a grant of land to provide for the worship of the god Mūlasthāna.[212]

(3) According to an inscription from Koppa taluk, in A.D. 1404, there were 52 shareholders at Sakaripura on the banks of the Tuṅgā (in the Āraga kingdom).[213]

(4) In A.D.1405-06, the assembly of Tribhuvana-mahādēvi-Chaturvēdimaṅgalam at Tiruvāṇḍarkōyil in the Pondicherry territory had 4000 men.[214]

(5) In A.D.1468, Rāma-Sītapura in Śrīraṅgapaṭṭaṇa taluk had 76 *mahājanas*.[215]

(6) In A.D.1539, there were 35 shareholders in the Achyutēndrapura *agrahāra*.[216]

These meetings were attended by all or nearly all the residents of the *agrahāras*. In order to convey the

---

211. *EC*, VIII, Tl.108.
212. *EC*, IV, ch.64.
213. *EC*, VI, Kp.25.
214. 217 of 1917.
215. *EC*, III, Sr.139.
216. *EC*, V, Bl.197.

idea that all were present, inscriptions use the term *aśēsha*. A few examples of such meetings may be given.

(1) In A.D.1366, the *mahājanas* of Rāmapura (Bannūr) in T. Narasipur taluk in Mysore District attended a meeting.[217]

(2) In A.D.1369, the *mahājanas* of the *agrahāra* Madhusūdanapura (Taḷirūr) in Arsikere taluk in Hassan District agreeing among themselves made a grant.[218]

(3) In A.D.1377, all the *mahājanas* of the two Kannūr *agrahāras* in Harahaḷḷi-nāḍu, and of Eḍihaḷḷi and Gavalūr in Shimoga taluk joined in making an application to all the *nāḍu* chiefs. (*aśēsha-mahājanangaḷu*).[219]

(4) In A.D.1521 all the *mahājanas* of the *agrahāra* Nāgamangala in Mandya District made a grant.[220]

(5) Again, in A.D.1549 all the *mahājanas* of Bhaṭṭaratnākara, which was Nāgamangala made a grant.[221]

Another expression used to denote that all were present was *Samasta*. For example, in A.D.1374 all the *mahājanas* of Honnāvaḷi in Arsikere taluk and all the farmers and subjects

217. *EC*, III, Tn.110.
218. *EC*, V, Ak.134.
219. *EC*, VII, Sh.35.
220. *EC*, IV, Ng.82.
221. *EC*, IV, Ng.5.

of Halukūr made a Śāsana for an exchange of land (Samasta Gāuṇḍa Prajegalu mahājanangalu).[222] Again, in A.D.1405 all the nāḍu mahājanas were present to make a grant (Samasta nāḍu mahājanangalu).[223]

In some inscriptions, we find the terms muntāda,[224] modalāda,[225] and name a few members. In these cases, some prominent members were named, and then it was said that those and the others were present (muntāda, modalāda).

Secondly, we have another kind of meeting in which in addition to the mahājanas, others in the same village or belonging to the neighbourhood attended.

(1) In A.D.1381, a grant was made by the mahājanas of Maddūr and other citizens of the place and all the gauḍaprajes. (aśēsha mahājanangalu, Samasthahaleru, Samasta gavuḍa prajegalu).[226]

(2) In A.D.1418, there was a meeting of all the residents of nine agrahāras and 1005 of Śātaḷige.[227]

(3) In A.D.1531, an assembly of learned Śiva-Brāhmaṇas, Māhēśvaras, and temple officials met in Kāñchī.[228]

222. EC, VI, Ak.63.
223. EC, VIII, Tl.22.
224. SII, IX (ii), No.440; MAR, 1940, No.16.
225. EC, IV, Ch.64.
226. MAR, 1938, No.73.
227. MAR, 1938, No.42.
228. EI, XXXIII, p.199.

Summons to the Mahājana Meetings:

From the evidence of inscriptions, we can infer that the mahājana meetings were summoned in two ways. Generally, the mahājanas met of their own accord. Inscriptional evidence for this kind of meeting is overwhelming. For example, in A.D.1372, the mahājanas of the agrahāra Prasanna Vijayapura in Gundlepet taluk in Mysore District, agreeing among themselves, made a grant for the support of the dancing girls.[229] Further, in A.D.1421, the mahājanas of Hiriya Holatūr in Sāntalige-nāḍu (Tirthahalli taluk in Shimoga District) sold certain lands.[230] Again, in A.D.1525, the mahājanas of Pratāpa-Dēvarāyapura in Hore-nāḍu belonging to the Muluvāgil Rājya made a grant.[231]

Secondly, the mahājana assembly could be summoned by certain officials. (1) In A.D.1346, under the orders of Mādhavamantri, Bollurāja got the charter of charity prepared with the mahājanas of Heddase and the leading men of the two agrahāras.[232] (2) In A.D.1368, minister Mādhava summoned to an assembly learned Kashmir Brahmanas, formed 80 shares and bestowed them on them.[233] (3) In A.D.1368, Ahōbhalanātha restored the temple of Gōpinātha as desired by his master, and in order that services in the temple be conducted forever

229. EC, IV, Gu.32.
230. EC, VIII, Tl.144.
231. EC, X, Mb.238.
232. MAR, 1929, No.90.
233. EC, VII, Sk.281.

held a meeting at Banavase which was attended among others by the mahājanas of the agrahāras Yeḷase and Kuppagadde.[234] (4) In A.D.1418, Sāvaṇṇa-Oḍeyar, governing Āraga summoned the residents of the nine agrahāras, and 1005 of Sātaḷige.[235] (5) In A.D.1531, Bhogarāja, governor of Kānchī summoned an assembly of learned Śiva-Brāhmaṇs, Māheśvaras and temple officials.[236]

Venue of the Mahājana Meetings:

The mahājana meetings were held in maṇṭapas (halls). We do not know whether they were in temples only or even outside. From inscriptions, it is clear that they did meet in temples. For example, in an epigraph dated A.D. 1466 to which reference was made earlier, the mahājanas of the village Gōrūr assembled in their temple.[237]

The mahājana meetings were also held in public places. According to a Pudukkottai inscription, in A.D.1443-44, a great assembly representing the temple authorities and the residents of Viraiyachchilai held its meeting in a flower-garden.[238]

234. MAR, 1929, No.113.
235. MAR, 1932, No.42.
236. EI, XXXIII, p.199.
237. MAR, 1936, No.5.
238. IPS, No.705.

Conduct of meetings:

Inscriptions use the terms Sarvaikematyaragi,[239] Aikasvamyavagi,[240] Vodambattu,[241] to denote that the decisions of the mahajanas were unanimous. It is only as a result of discussions that unanimity was possible on matters that came before the assembly.

Section: 13

Functions of the Mahajana Assembly:

Like the village assembly known as the Uru which performed several functions, the mahajana assembly of the agrahara also performed a variety of functions, religious, administrative, public, economic, social and judicial.

Religious Aspects:

One of the important functions of the Mahajana assemblies related to the administration of religious institutions like the temple and the matha. They also maintained charitable institutions like the ordinary chhatra or special free boarding and lodging houses. They made endowments to temples. Some examples of such activities are found in the following inscriptions:-

1) In A.D.1368, Aubhalanatha (i.e., Ahobalanatha) restored

---

239. MAR, 1936, No.5.
240. EC, IX, Me.11.
241. EC, XII, Tp.60; MAR, 1938, No.73; MAR, 1928, No.56.

the temple of Gopīnātha as desired by his master Mādhava ruling Banavase 12000. In order that services in the temple might be conducted forever, he applied for help to the gauda praje (village headmen and the people) of 18 Kampanas (divisions of Gutti), and also the mahājanas of the agrahāras Yelase and Kuppagadde. The assembly (Kūṭa) made a gift of land for the benefit of the temple.[242]

2) In order to provide for the worship of the god Mūlasthāna the mahājanas of Sarvajña-Vishṇupura Homma in Chamarajanagara taluk in Mysore District, in A.D.1380, made a grant of land to the south-west of Homma to Bhutaṇḍiharuva, the temple priest of the god.[243]

3) An inscription of the time of king Dēvarāya (undated), on a stone set up near Sūḷekere, by the side of the road from Gerasoppa, records the grant of a wet field for the food offering and other services of god Kōṭēśvara by Kallapa and Ketapa with the consent of the mahājanas (mahājanangaḷan-oḍambaḍisi).[244]

4) In A.D.1521, the mahājanas of the agrahāra Vishṇusamudra in Kadur taluk in Chikmagalur District granted for the god Janārdana some wet land.[245]

5) In A.D.1523, the mahājanas of the agrahāra Kuriya-Kuppe

242. MAR, 1929, No.113.
SII, XX, No.230.
243. EC, IV, Ch.64.
244. MAR, 1928, No.113.
245. EC, VI, Kd.91.

surnamed Anantasētu in Hospet Taluk, made a gift of a garden land for the worship of god Virūpāksha.[246]

6) In A.D.1524, the mahājanas of Pratāpa-Dēvarāya-pura in Mulbagal taluk in Kolar District granted land to provide for the offerings and illuminations of god Rāmachandra.[247]

7) In A.D. 1549, the mahājanas of Bhaṭṭa-ratnākara, which was Nāgamangala (in Mandya District) gave for the god Vīrabhadra a grant of the first five paṇa which was received every year at the Vīrabhadra temple.[248]

8) In A.D.1556, the mahājanas of the agrahāra Sōmasamudra in Bellary taluk made a grant of land for the service of the god Lakshmīnārāyaṇa in the village.[249]

9) In A.D.1560, the mahājanas of Belgōḍ agrahāra (Narasiṁhapura, Thirthahalli Taluk) of the Aivattanāḍu of the Āraga-rājya granted specified lands for the offerings of the god Lakshmī-Nārāyaṇa, and also gave fourteen (gadyāṇa) for the Chhatra of the same temple.[250]

We have also instances of individuals receiving grants for service in temples or for the maintenance of satras and maṭhas and public charities being entrusted to the care

246. SII, IX (ii), No.514.
247. EC, X, Mb.238.
248. EC, IX, Ng.5.
249. SII, IX (ii), No.662.
250. EC, VIII, Tl.103.

of the local *mahājanas*. Land was also granted for the building of temples. The following inscriptions testify to such land grants:-

1) In A.D.1466, as the old village of Goraūr (Gōrūr) was in ruins, a new village was set up, and the image of the god Vāsudēva inthe old village was transferred to a temple erected in the new village. The funds necessary for the purpose were raised partly from a grant of 125 *gadyāṇas* from the palace treasury at the village Vosana (Hassan), and the Watchman Narasiṅgaṇa of the village Bagavadi collected 50 *gadyāṇas*. For the service rendered by the watchman in collecting the funds for the purpose and in building the new village and temple, the *mahājanas* of Gōrūr assembled in their temple, prayed for his welfare and granted him some wet land on the bank of the river in their village.[251]

2) In A.D.1534, all the *Hebbāruva* Brahmans of Kuḍalūr and Maḷalūr (in Nelamangala, Bangalore District) with the consent of all the farmers and subjects of these villages, gave to the temple priest (*Sthānika*) Nārāyaṇayya land (specified) for the service of the god Tirumala, together with certain taxes.[252]

---

251. *MAR*, 1936, No.5.
252. *EC*, IX, Nl.31.

3) An inscription of A.D.1555 contains an agreement entered into by the *mahājanas* of Śivapura i.e., Malipattana in Arkalgud Taluk, which allowed the Brahman temple servants to enjoy the village Tarikal. The village was granted for services in the temple of Ulameśvara consisting of food offerings etc., to the god.[253]

4) In A.D.1591, a gift of land in the Brahman village of Narranttur *alias* Rāmabhadrapuram, was made by Viśva Panditar, Agent of Ettūr Tirumalai Kumāra Tātācharya who was one of the managers of the Aruḷāla Perumāḷ temple, to Nallammangar, for conducting the festivals Tiruvadhyanam-Udaiyavamsivappa and Ulagamunda-peruvayansivappa in the month of Margaḷi in the same temple.[254]

Administrative Aspects:

An important function of an administrative nature undertaken by the *mahājana* assembly related to the settlement of boundary disputes in the *agrahāra* and also between *agrahāra* villages. They also exchanged lands:-

1) The *agrahāra* of Hariharapura, also called Kollangere which existed in the pre-Vijayanagara period continued to function in the Vijayanagara times also.[255] In A.D.1397,

---

253. *MAR*, 1940, No.16.
254. 421 of 1919.
255. *EC*, V, Ak.115.

the mahājanas of the place made a regulation to the effect that they would dispose of any dispute arising as to the lands of the village Suliyakere, which they had sold to one Ayyaṇṇa.[256] Further, in A.D.1318 they gave a Śāsana to one Rāmaṇṇa embodying the following clauses in their agreement. "The land in our village which Hariyanna and others (named) being unable to manage or to pay the original fixed rent and the extra taxes, transferred to us with a Vōle - that land, we have received from Rāmanna eight gadyāna, for Kattuge, Kānike, Rāmanna will pay to the Brahmans for the land one gadyāṇa a year in the month of Pushya and will manage the land; the Brahmans themselves will defray any tax imposed by the palace. That we should pay such taxes imposed by our village seems not to be the custom. This land, Rāmaṇṇa, may mortgage, sell or give away. Any dispute relating thereto will be settled by the Brahmans. To this land there is no reason to connect the northern field; that field the Brahmans themselves will enjoy. The land is granted to Rāmaṇṇa and his posterity."[257]

2) In A.D.1341, the mahājanas of Udbhava Narasiṁhapura (Bēlūr), agreeing among themselves, wrote a Śāsana exchanging the temple lands of the gods Mādhava, Gōpāla and Lakshmī-Nārāyaṇa, as they were situated below the town for others (specified).[258]

---

256. EC, XII, Tk.190.
257. EC, XII, Tk.193.
258. EC, IV, Ng.40.

3) In A.D.1374, all the *mahājanas* of Honnāvaḷi gave to Bomma Gauḍa and other *gauḍas* (named), and all the farmers and subjects of Halukur a *Śāsana* for an exchange as follows: details of 470 poles of land in Bhagavati-ghaṭṭa, a hamlet of Honnāvaḷi exchanged for the same extent of land in Budanahāḷu; attached to Tulikeyahaḷḷi, a hamlet of Halukūr.[259]

Building Activities:

1) The *mahājana* assembly constructed public works like temples and tanks. The assembly of the *agrahāra* Vishṇusamudra (*Kereyasanthe*) erected a *bhoga-manṭapa* in front of the temple of the god Janārdana.[260]

2) An epigraph of A.D.1410 tells us that the Brahmans living in Harihara-Kshētra at their own expense built a dam to the river Haridrā,[261] and provided themselves with irrigational facilities. An inscription of the same year from Harihara gives us more details about it. The *mahājanas* at their own expense built a dam to the river Haridrā and also led a channel to Harihara. Dēva Rāya made an agreement ~~for~~ between the god Harihara and the *mahājanas* living in the Harihara-kshētra. By this, of all the lands irrigated by the channel, two-thirds had to go for the god Harihara, and one third to the *mahājanas* who at their own expense constructed the

---

259. *EC*, V, Ak.63.
260. *EC*, VI, Kd.91.
261. *EC*, VIII, Tl.196.

the channel, free of all imposts. The mahājana shareholders, for carrying out the work of the dam, being pleased gave to Bullapa from their own share two Khandugas of land. The agreement also contains directions that the annual repairs and other expenses, should be borne in the same proportion of two-third and one-third respectively. The water of the channel should be distributed in the same proportion.[262] From this inscription it is clear, (i) that the mahājanas acted in a corporate manner; (ii) that they undertook the construction of public works; (iii) that they rewarded the person who undertook the construction by giving out of their own share land. In this instance they also granted lands to the composer of the Śāsana and the person who consecretated the land.

3) In A.D.1521, all the mahājanas of the agrahāra Nāgamangala granted to Vithanna a ōle for the construction of a tank at the point in the river to the east of Hosahalli. On his constructing the tank they granted to Vithanna as a Kere-godange, under the waste weir of this Māyi-Dēvi tank, and under the sluice one share out of the many fields that were there.[263]

4) According to an inscription from Anantapur, in A.D.1538, the mahājanas of Nāgarakere gifted a channel and a tank.[264]

---

262. EC, XI, Dg.23 and 29.
263. EC, IV, Ng.82.
264. V. Rangacharya, A Topographical List of the Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency (collected till 1915) with notes and references (Madras, 1919) I, Ap. 76.

Goodwill existing between the Mahājanas and others:

Numerous epigraphs prove the goodwill existing between the mahājanas and other sections of the people. An inscription of A.D.1368 from Chamarajanagar taluk relates to the harmony that existed between the Brahmanas and other religious sections of the people. Certain Gauḍas (named) of Uyyanapaḷḷi together with all the Brahmaṇas of Kēśavapura or Nagara and other Gauḍas (named) of various villages, granted from each family the petty taxes, the taxes and lands of Mātruhaḷḷi, to provide for the service of the god Anitēśvara of Haradanahaḷḷi. The epigraph tells us that "agreeing among themselves and of their own accord, in the presence of the officer, Siriyaṇṇa, they granted them, with presentation of a coin and water to the god Anitēśvara."[265] According to an inscription from Arkalgud taluk in Hassan District, in A.D.1404, the Mahāsāvantādhipati Kuḍalūr Mañchārya Nāyaka, with all the farmers and subjects of Kolanalūr-sthaḷa made to all the Mahājanas and the agrahāra Sarvajña-Bhāskarapura (Koḷunalūr), a grant of Utenahaḷḷi village, with a tank in the low ground.[266] In A.D.1408, all the farmers and subjects of the Āraga Eighteen Kampaṇa and those of the three cities agreeing among themselves, made a grant of (lands) in the

265. EC, IV, Ch.113.
266. EC, V, Ag.52.

Surali village to the Brahmans (named) after having turned it into an agrahāra called Nāgasamudra.[267] In A.D.1534, the temple of the god Tirumala of Chakkare in the Kudalūr-Sthala also called Rājarāja-Chōla-Chaturvēdimangalam in Kelale-nādu, by order of the royal treasurer Timmappayya, was given to Nārāyaṇayya, establisher of the path of the Vedas. All the Hebbārava Brahmans of Kudalūr and Malalūr with the consent of all the farmers and subjects of these villages, gave to the temple priest Nārāyaṇayya land (specified) for the service of the god Tirumala, together with certain taxes (named).[268]

Economic Activities:

The mahājana assemblies had powers to settle land revenue questions, and questions relating to other taxes. They were the agents of the government for the collection of state revenues. They had certain rights to levy fresh taxes and remit old ones. But the remissions concerned only the local taxes collected for local purposes. The government usually communicated to the local assembly remission of taxes or the imposition of fresh ones or their assignments for temple expenses. The following inscriptions testify to the performance of these functions:

1) According to an inscription from Koppa taluk in Chikmagalur

---

267. EC, VIII, Tl.22.
268. EC, IX, Cn.155.

District, in A.D.1400, the Brahmans of .... Pattana bought, through agents for 300 Varaha the Halamuttur village together with its hamlets in the Santalige-nadu and divided the rent to be paid among themselves.[269]

2) In A.D.1409, the mahajanas of the same agrahara Koppatulur gave to Vidyanatha-deva, a grant of land, together with the taxes, free of all imposts.[270]

3) In A.D.1419, the mahajanas of Rajabaranahalli in Hampanahalu Taluk in Bellary District granted rent-free lands to other Brahmans (named).[271]

4) An inscription of A.D.1556 at Pennahobilam in Gooty Taluk in Anantpur District records that Sadāsivarāya exempted the mahajanas of the agraharas of Anadale, Nimbegalu, Davapanahalli, Kalidevanahalli, Sirivara, Revinayakanahalli, Varagudi, Tumbeganuru, Raganahalu, Tavaregole, Chikapepali, Timmapura, Hoturu, Benakanahalli, Antarasanahalu and Kamalahalu situated in Uruvakonde-Sime, a sub-division of Rayadurga-venthe from some taxes.[272]

5) An epigraph at Tirumakkottai in the Tanjore district records an order to the mahajanas of Palaiyur that the old

---

269. EC, VI, Kp.35.
270. EC, VI, Kp.26.
271. SII, IX (ii), No.440.
272. SII, IX (ii), No.663.

method of levying taxes in grain for the protection of the country should be revived in place of the existing custom of collecting taxes both in grain and in money.[273] Since the local body collected the taxes due to the government, it had to be kept informed of any change made so that the necessary changes in the records in the register may be made.

6) The assembly of Śiruvayal decided to exclude Sarvamānya lands belonging to a certain deity and to include others for taxation purposes.[274]

The mahājanas also acted as trustees. For example, in A.D.1390, one Mallappa made a grant of land of the sowing capacity of half a Khanduga in Mārihaḷḷi for food offering to god Gaṇapati. The mahājanas were to look after the gift.[275] Likewise, when one Rāḳappa, the son of a merchant Chinnappa, made a grant of a dry field of the sowing capacity of 10 Koḷagas for the service of the god Kalledēva during the reign of Bukka II, the field was placed in charge of the mahājanas of the village.[276]

Again, an inscription of A.D.1430, of the time of Dēva Rāya II, seems to record the grant of certain taxes for the god Varadarāja by the king. The mahājanas of Vogeṭa were

273. 259 of 1917.
274. 178 of 1926.
275. MAR, 1924, No.90.
276. MAR, 1925, para 51.

to carry on the provisions of the gift as long as the Sun and the Moon endure.[277]

They had the right to sell away or gift the lands in the agrahāras under their jurisdiction. They could acquire lands on behalf of the village. They could exchange lands and enter into agreements concerning them. They could make land grants to individuals. They could redistribute the lands. The following inscriptions testify to these activities of the mahājanas:

1) According to an inscription in Tirthahalli taluk in Shimoga District, in A.D.1421, the mahājanas of Hiriya Holalūr in Sāntaligenādu sold certain land in Hangarabayal for 48 hon, the price fixed by the arbitrator.[278]

2) The assembly of the village of Tirupperundurai made a gift of two pieces of land to a temple in the same village.[279]

3) According to an inscription from Arsikere taluk in Hassan District, in A.D.1374, all the mahājanas of Honnāvali and the farmers and subjects (samasta gavuda prajegalu) of Halukūr exchanged land as follows:- details of 470 poles of land in Bhagavati-ghatta, a hamlet of Honnāvali, exchanged for the same extent of land in Budanahālu, attached to

277. MAR, 1919, para 88.
278. EC, VIII, Tl.144.
279. 509 of 1925.

Tuḷikeyahaḷḷi, a hamlet of Halukūr.[280]

4) In A.D.1378, the mahājanas of 15 shares out of the 45 of Tīrthahaḷḷi agreeing among themselves granted certain lands (specified) to the Brahmans of the 30 shares of Virūpakshapura (Koṇandūr).[281]

5) An epigraph at Karaḍigurikí, Malur Taluk, dated A.D.1381, registers a grant to some one of the Kapilagōtra by one Madubhaṭṭa and other mahājanas.[282]

Social Aspects:

We have also evidence of the mahājana assemblies trying to improve society by introducing reforms. In A.D. 1424-5, the mahājanas of Paḍaivīḍu-rājya made a bold stand to which we can trace the remission of taxes on marriages of all classes in Ballāḷapura by Dēva Rāya II in A.D.1432. People were compelled to sell estates due to the exorbitant nature of dowry and the resulting heavy expenses of marriage. According to the inscription, the Brahmans of Paḍaivīḍu-rājya made an agreement thus: "That henceforth marriages among them were to be concluded only by Kanyādāna, that is, the father had to give his daughter to the bride-groom gratuitously, and that both the father who accepted money, and the

280. EC, V, Ak.63.
281. EC, VIII, Tl.28.
282. MAR, 1913-14, para 94.

bridegroom who paid money, were to be subjected to punishment by the king, and to be excommunicated from their caste." The document contains the signature of "the great men of all branches of sacred studies".[283]

An instance of the Brahmans bringing about social reform by elevating the classes which were socially on a lower scale is given in an epigraph. One such instance is that of the Brahmans who invested 500 oil-mongers with the sacred thread. Poet Dindima who was one of the mahājanas of Mallunḍrum alias Prauḍha-dēvarāyapuram gives us these details. The fact that oil-mongers feel grateful to the Brahman family by accepting one of its members as their guru (teacher) indicates that, at least in this one instance, there is evidence of the service the Brahmans rendered to the cause of society.[284]

We have an instance in which the mahājanas sat along with others to adjudge a case of caste degradation. In the 16th century, an outcast Brahman's property had to be disposed off. A Brahman of Chēra-mahādēvi (i.e., Shermadevi in the Ambasamudram taluk), having fallen from his original high caste, his land and house-site were confiscated to the local temple of Tiruvēṅgaḷanātha, with the income where of four measures of rice were cooked for the god's offerings

283. SII, I, No.56
284. ARSIE, 1912, p.90.

and used for feeding the Brahmanas. The adjudging body that sat over this case of caste degradation among others included the learned men (Vidvan-mahājanas) of Chēramahādēvi, Elapuram and Narasāpuram.[285]

Judicial Powers:

These assemblies appear to have exercised some judicial powers. We have inscriptions to show that they tried certain cases and punished the offenders. For instance, the Mahājanas of the agrahāras of Kuḷattūr, Aḷambalam, Śaḍaiyanpaṭṭu and Muttiyakuriccci decided a dispute between two priests and the managers of the temple of Kāmēśvaram Uḍaiya Nāyanār at Āragaḷūr in the Salem District. This case concerned the privilege of worshipping the god all the thirty days in the month, and how that decision was given effect to by the concerned temple authorities.[286] The case is briefly stated as follows:- A has been enjoying for a long time the privilege of worshipping the god all the thirty days of the month in the temple, while actually only 15 days belonged to him by right and the remaining to B who abandoned worship and left it unclaimed. B sold 7½ days of privilege of worship out of 15 days privilege of worship to another priest 'C' and gave him a sale deed. The sale deed so executed, now deprived 'A' of the acquired right enjoyed by him for

285. Ibid., 1917, p.130.
286. 430 of 1913.

some generations back. 'A' became issueless and the 'Nāttār' volunteered to settle the question of enjoyment and during the period of settlement of the question, the worship of the temple was performed by an outsider. Then 'A' appealed to Tirumala Nāyaka of the district. He and the Nāttār together advised the parties to put the case before the Mahājanas of the agrahāras of Kulattūr, Alambalam, Śadaiyanpattu and Muttiyakuricci. They assembled together and heard the case from both sides and delivered the following judgment: "A" may have been the hereditary holder of only 15 days of privilege and it was not fair on the part of B to sell part of the disputed portion there to an outsider 'C' while the right to purchase in virtue of long enjoyment primarily rested in 'A'. 'A' must continue to enjoy the full 30 days as before and the sale deed given to 'C' should be cancelled.[287] The lands of guilty persons could be confiscated. In A.D.1386-7, the village assembly of Tirupperundurai in the Tanjore district gave to the local temple land which it had confiscated from one Āndān Pillai of Tirupattūr on account of some fault committed by him.[288]

Other Activities:

Epigraphs refer to a variety of other functions performed by the mahājana assemblies. For instance, they

---

287. 413 of 1914, ARSIE, 1914, para 26.
288. 509 of 1925.

encouraged learning. An inscription of A.D.1381 records the grant of a plot of wet land of the sowing capacity of two candies together with a dry field and a garden situated on the lands of a certain Māyaṇṇa to the east of the village Maddūr unanimously by the mahājanas and the nāḍu people of the village for reciting purāṇic stories, feeding pilgrims and recitation of the Vēdas in the temple of god Dēśinātha.[289]

The art of dancing received the encouragement of the Mahājanas. For example, in A.D.1369 the mahājanas of Madhusūdanapura (Taḷirūr) made a grant in Imme-Uyagauṇḍiya-haḷḷi, for the support of the dancing girls in the service of the god Madhusūdana.[290] Similarly, according to a Gundlupet taluk inscription of A.D.1372, the mahājanas of Prasanna-Vijayapura made a grant for the support of the dancing girls.[291]

Section 14:

Disappearance of Some Agrahāras:

There is evidence of the disappearance of some agrahāras under Vijayanagara rule. Baḷguḷi (Bagali, Bellary District), ~~in Karnataka~~ had civic life for 400 years from the 10th century A.D. to the commencement of the 14th century A.D.

---

289. MAR, 1928, p.59.
290. EC, V, Ak.134.
291. EC, IV, Gu.32.

An epigraph dated A.D.1530 records that while Krishnappa-Nāyaka, son of Hadapada Bayyapa Nāyaka was ruling over Kottūru in Kogali district, and the thirty-two provinces and Halavi Nāyaka was ruling over Bāguli in the Kottūru-Valita, Lingamma, wife of Lakkisetti, the Pattanasvāmi of Bāguli made a gift of paddy and gold for the service of the god Kalidēva.[292] Another epigraph dated A.D.1551 records that Helavi-Nāyaka, son of Chami-Nāyaka of Bāguli, in the sub-division of Kottūru-Sīme, which had been granted by Hadapada-Krishnappa Nāyaka exempted the shepherds of Bāguli and its hamlets from tax on their sheep.[293] From these epigraphs, we can see how Bāguli came under the control of '*Amara-nāyaka*' and thus lost its self-government.

Section 15:

History of Kuduvalli, Upēndrapura and Kalasa:

Before concluding this chapter on the *agrahāras* in Vijayanagara, it is proposed to deal with the history of three *agrahāras*, namely, Kuduvalli, Upēndrapura (Maddūr) and Kalasa.

Kuduvalli:

From inscriptions we get the history of Kuduvalli in Vijayanagara times for nearly a century. Kuduvalli was an

292. *SII*, IX (ii), No.640.
293. *Ibid.*, No.641.

agrahāra village. It is in the Chikmagalur Taluk, about seven miles from Chikmagalur. An inscription[294] explains the circumstances that led to the formation of the agrahāra. The record begins by stating that the village was in the enjoyment of the Śriṅgēri maṭha being given away by king Harihara II. Though the date of this inscription is not genuine, we have another epigraph,[295] which refers to the gift of the village by Harihara to Śriṅgēri maṭha and its division into Vṛittis and their distribution among several Brahmans. When Purushōttama-Bhārati was the Pontiff of the Śriṅgēri matt, he gave away a part of the village of the annual value of nearly 21 Varahas to his blood relatives. When Rāmachandra Bhārati succeeded to the pontificate, all this land was taken away from the relatives of the previous guru and given to one Mallibhaṭṭa of Āraga. Thus a portion of the village was in the enjoyment of the new landlord Mallibhaṭṭa and the rest belonged to the maṭha.

The inscription proceeds to say that due to the displeasure of the spirit of Brahmanāthadēvar worshipped as the god in Śriṅgēri maṭha, cattle died in large number, and the evil was warded off by the intervention of one Narahariбhaṭṭa, who came to Śriṅgēri and propitiated the spirit. The pontiff, pleased with this granted to Naraharibhaṭṭa all the land in Kuḍuvaḷḷi except the portion belonging to Mallibhaṭṭa.

---

294. MAR, 1929, No.18.
295. EC, VI, Cm.88.

Naraharibhatta lived in the village Kondanahalli nearby, looking after his newly acquired lands.

It is then stated that Naraharibhatta discovered that his own tenants belonging to the caste of devara-makkalu (fishermen) in the village Kuduvalli plundered his house at night, and carried off the food supplies to their houses. So he represented to the Sringeri Svami that he could not manage the village by himself and that it should be divided into Vrittis and distributed among many Brahmanas. Accordingly, Ramachandra-bharati divided the lands in the village consisting of wet land of the sowing capacity of 147 Khandugas into 33⅝ Vrittis of 4¼ Khandugas each and distributed them among various Brahmanas. The balance of the sowing capacity of 3½ Khandugas was given to the devara makkalu community of the village (1391 A.D.).

The members of the devaramakkalu community enjoyed their land for some time, gave it away to a Brahman named Doddanna-bhatta to conduct a certain service in the Siva temple at Gautamesvara (2 miles from Kuduvalli). In course of time the community declined in number and at last no one belonging to it was left in the village. After the death of Doddanna-bhatta without issue, his property went to Giribhatta of Singapura who had a mortgage on it. Sometime later, he also died issueless and the property was taken by the family

of Upādhyara Narasidēvaru in A.D. 1402. According to the writer of the present record, as the entire village had a claim over the property, the unclaimed lands should have reverted to the Śringēri maṭha.

Upēndrapura (Maddūr):

Upēndrapura, which is the same as modern Maddūr in Yelandur hobli, was an agrahāra. Monthly headmanship (māsaveggaḍetana) as already mentioned existed in ~~in inscriptions with reference to~~ this agrahāra. An inscription of A.D.1327 mentions that a certain Śravaṇappāchārya Vijñēśvara-Dīkshitōpādhyāya was the monthly headman. The Mahājanas in that year made a grant to five persons.[296] In A.D.1328, one Asama-Dēva is mentioned as holding the month's headmanship.[297] In that year the mahājanas made a grant to build Upēndrapaṭṭaṇa anew in the dry fields of Chiraduvu, and construct altogether eight free houses. In order to encourage the building of new houses, they made tax exemptions for the houses. The remaining houses for three to seven years from the date of construction would be free from taxation. In the fourth year, for every house 12 cubits wide by 30 cubits long would have to pay according to the rate of 5 ...as Kaṭṭu-guttige. Again, in A.D. 1336, the month's headman was one Karatti of Udugundūr. The mahājanas made a grant

296. EC, IV, Yl.40.
297. EC, IV, Yl.39.

UNIVERSITY ... LIBRARY

to one Mamboja, son of the coppersmith Pemmoja. Mamboja having pleased them by the practice of his calling, they made a grant to him rent-free of certain lands there, erecting houses for his caste. Mamboja and the coppersmith's children who settled on that land would enjoy it tax-free.[298] In these instances, we can see the mahājanas exercising the function of granting lands and tax exemptions to individuals. In A.D.1381, the mahājanas (Maddūra Śrīmad aśesha - mahājanangalu) and nāḍu people of the village with all the gauḍas granted unanimously a plot of land east of the village Maddūr for reciting Puranic stories, feeding pilgrims and the recitation of Vedas in the temple. The donee or donees are not mentioned in the inscription.[299]

Narasiṁha Chaturvēdimangala:

Narasiṁha Chaturvēdimangala, which is the same as modern Maddūr in Mandya district was an agrahāra during the Vijayanagara period. We learn from an inscription of A.D.1406 that Maddūr was known as Narasiṁha Chaturvēdimangala. As we have seen making grants to temples was an important function of the agrahāra assembly. All the residents of the place made a grant of certain dues and taxes to provide for the worship of the god Vaidyanātha.[300] In A.D.1589, the mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Tirumala Rāya's sons, Rāma-Rājayya and Tirumala-Rājayya made a grant of the village of Kabbare belonging to Maddūr to two Brahmanas as an agrahāra.[301] In A.D.1591 grants were made to

298. EC, IV, Yl.38.
299. MAR, 1928, No.55.
300. EC, III, Md.28.
301. Ibid., 25.

provide for the worship of the gods Narasimha, Rāmachandra and Allālanātha in order that merit might accrue to Rama Rājayya.[302] In A.D.1622, Rāma-Dēva-Rāya made grants to three Brahmanas (named) of certain villages belonging to Maddūr in Keḷale-nāḍu attached to Śrīraṅgapaṭṭaṇa.[303] Before concluding the treatment of Narasimha Chaturvēdimaṅgala, reference may be made to an inscription of A.D.1663 to show that the agrahāra continued to exist even after Vijayanagara times. In A.D.1663, Dēva-Rāja-Oḍeyar's son, Dēva-Rāja made a grant to the agrahāra which he had established at Kūḍali, otherwise called Dēvarājapura, the village called Maddūr, which he had inherited by his victories.[304]

Section 16:

Kaḷasa:

It is now proposed to observe how the agrahāra of Kaḷasa in Mudigere Taluk fared under its assembly from time to time. Kaḷasa is called the thousand village (Sāvira grāma) in inscriptions.

The epigraphs from Mudigere refer to the three chiefs or prabhus of the thousand village of Kaḷasa. (Kaḷasada Sāviragrāma mūvaru Prabhugaḷu). The Kannada version of the

302. Ibid., 5.
303. Ibid., 17.
304. Ibid., 14.

inscription No.41 refers to namma chāvadiya buddhivantaru. Chāvaḍi was also a territorial division in Vijayanagara times, and it was under the control of the wise men of the locality sometimes called buddhivantaru. Kaḷasa itself was under the control of either the three gauḍa prabhus or along with them the Hebbāruvaru.[305] They were the Hiriya Hāruvaru or the big Brahmins corresponding to the Mahājanas of other inscriptions. There were Hebbāruvas in Māvinakēri, Hosakēri, Gulakēri who were witnesses to a gift.[306] These were obviously streets or parts in Kaḷasa having their own assemblies of Hebbāruvas. One of the inscriptions refers to the Brahmapuri[307] of the Brahmans.

In A.D.1370 when Virupaṇṇa-Oḍeyar was governing the region, he made a grant to the Brahmans of the Brahmapuri of the god Kaḷasanātha. The grant was made so that the Brahmins should conduct the anointing, prayers and other ceremonies.[308] In A.D. 1419, Bayirarasa-Oḍeyar, in the presence of the three prabhus made a grant.[309] In A.D.1493 in the presence of the three chiefs of the thousand village (Sāvira grāmada gauḍa prabhugaḷu) one Sōmaṇṇa gave to the god Kaḷasanātha twenty gadyāṇa to provide for feeding one

305. EC, VI, Mg. Nos.54, 57, 62; MAR, 1934, No.18.
306. EC, VI, Mg. No.62.
307. EC, VI, Mg. No.67; MAR, 1934, No.19.
308. EC, VI, Mg. No.57.
309. EC, VI, Mg. No.46.

Brahman.[310] Again, in A.D.1493, in the presence of the three chiefs, Krishna-hebbār made a grant for the same god.[311] Further, in the same year, another hebbār Kēśava-Dēva, made a grant.[312] An inscription of A.D.1494 refers to grants for worship. In this instance, the money was paid in the presence of the grāma-hebbāruva chief of Brahmans in the village.[313] In A.D.1516 when Krishnarāya-vīra-Immaḍi-Bhayirarasa-Voḍeyar was governing the kingdom of Kaḷasa, Śūrappa-Sēnabhōva, in the presence of the three chiefs of the thousand village of Kaḷasa made a grant of various lands to the god Kaḷasanātha.[314] Again, in the same year, the temple of the god Kailāsanātha was repaired through the wise men of the chāvaḍi (chāvaḍi buddhivantaru). In the presence of the three chiefs, they gave 30 gadyāṇas to provide for bathing (abhishēkha) for one month the god Kaḷasanātha.[315] In A.D.1524, in the presence of the three chiefs, Saṅkappa-Sēnabōru of Mēgunda made a grant of 10 honnu to the god. Further, in the presence of Śūrappa-Sēnabōru and that of the hebbār families, one Ummakka took that money for her grandson Dēvarasa's marriage and in lieu thereof gave certain specified lands.[316] An inscription of

310. EC, VI, Mg. No.50.
311. EC, VI, Mg. No.54.
312. EC, VI, Mg. No.56.
313. MAR, 1934, No.18.
314. EC, VI, Mg. No.39.
315. EC, VI, Mg. No.41.
316. EC, VI, Mg. No.62.

A.D.1547 which does not give the name of the donor states that the charity was placed before the three prabhus for approval.[317] In A.D. 1552, Bhayirasaṇṇeji who was performing the pārupatya of Kaḷasa made in the presence of the three chiefs certain grants for the Monday ceremonies of the same god.[318] Lastly, in A.D.1555, in the presence of the three chiefs, Dēvaṇṇa-heggaḍe made a grant.[319]

All the inscriptions referred to above cover the years from A.D.1370 to A.D.1555. They refer to the activities of the agrahāra Kaḷasa which had three gauḍa prabhugaḷu or chiefs whose approval was taken. There were also the buddhivantaru or the wise men of the locality, the hebbāruvāru or the chief brahmans, and the Brahmapuri which was a Brahman settlement. Kaḷasa is a typical example of an autonomous agrahāra in Vijayanagara times.

In conclusion, it can be said that one characteristic feature of the Brahmanas was their corporate life. As Majumdar points out, the tradition of living a corporate existence seems to have been handed down from very early times.[320] This tradition was maintained by the Vijayanagara rulers in the agrahāras in the empire. The agrahāra was a body corporate with powers of self-government. The agrahāras afford us ample testimony of their corporate life.

---

317. MAR, 1934, No.15.
318. EC, VI, Mg. No.40.
319. EC, VI, Mg. No.60.
320. R.C. Majumdar: Corporate Life in Ancient India (Poona, 1922) p.339.

CHAPTER IV

THE MAHANADU AND THE NADU

Introductory:

Section 1:

The Mahānādu in pre-Vijayanagara Times:

In Vijayanagara times the nādu was a regional body. Several villages were included in it. Thus it constituted a larger political unit than a village. We also come across the mahānādu, an organization which did not control directly any district or division. It was a large assembly, and since it appears to have been a representative public body, we have to include it in giving an account of local government.

Inscriptions refer to the transactions of a number of large assemblies that were functioning in different parts of the Deccan inthe pre-Vijayanagara period. They appear to have played a vital part in the social, political and economic life of the people of ancient Deccan. They were popular in nature and of a representative character.

The Mahānādu in Medieval Karnataka was the largest local assembly.[1] It included three categories of members, namely, the guilds of the district and of important towns, representatives of the people of the place where the meeting

1. G.S. Dikshit, Local Self-Government in Mediaeval Karnātaka pp.29-35.

was held and the officers of the government of the region. In one such meeting in A.D.1135, there were present the guilds, the feudatory of Kollāpura (modern Kolhapur), an officer of his household, and representatives of the towns of Kuṇḍi, Torambage, Mysige, Baḷeyavaṭṭaṇa and Kavaḍegolla.[2] In A.D.1144, a similar meeting was held at Sēḍbāḷ.[3] We have also an example of a mahānāḍu meeting in A.D. 1186.[4] Another assembly similar to Mahānāḍu was that of "the residents of eighteen districts".

In mediaeval Kerala also, there was an assembly of "the residents of the eighteen districts."[5] In later Chōḷa times, in Tamilnadu, there were associations of the members of the assembly of eighteen districts. An inscription[6] records that the members of the assembly of merchants of Bhuvanaika-vitran-madigai and those of the assembly of the eighteen districts, assembled in full and without deficiency in the pavilion called Vikkiramapāṇḍiyan-maṇḍapa of the temple of Jayaṅgoṇḍa chōḷīśvara-muḍaiyār at Rājādhirāja-Chaturvēdimaṅgalam, held convincing discussions making all agree, and made assignments to the temple. We can draw two inferences from this inscription. Firstly, the assembly's first concern was to see that there was the

---

2. Ibid., p.30; EI, XIX, pp.33-35.

3. EI, XIX, pp.37-39.

4. Karnāṭak Inscriptions, (Ed.R.S. Panchamukhi), I, pp.40 ff.

5. See A. Govinda Warriar's article in Indian Historical Quarterly, IV, for an account of this assembly.

6. SII, VI, No.40, A.D.1288; QJMS, XLV, pp.29-47, 70-98, 270-286, K.V. Subrahmanya Iyer, the Largest Provincial Organizations in Ancient India, See articles by the same author in QJMS, XLVI, pp.8-12.

required quorum. Secondly, the fact that the assembly held convincing discussions and brought about unanimous agreement among them reflects the democratic nature of these organizations. There are other inscriptions[7] which refer to similar meetings and transactions. From these inscriptions, we learn that agriculture, administration, art, commerce, industry and trade came under their purview. These subjects are important ones that engage the attention of any government. The unifying force in these large assemblies was community of interest. In the Vijayanagara period, we come across the Mahānāḍu and similar large assemblies which retained some of the corporate spirit of earlier times.

Section 2:

The Mahānāḍu and other larger assemblies in the Vijayanagara period:

Inscriptions attest to the existence of the Mahānāḍu in Vijayanagara times. An epigraph of A.D.1525[8] from Dummi village in Holalkere Taluk records, that Keñcha Vīraṇṇoḍeyar of the Nirāśraya-maṭha of Dummi, granted, out of the mūle-visa (cess) which the gauḍas, paṭṭanasvāmi and citizens and the mahānāḍu of Dummi granted to him, one half

7. SII, VI, Nos.41, 47, 439, Ibid., VII, No.129; Ibid., VIII, Nos.198, 442.

8. EC, XI. Hk.15.

for the offerings to the god Vīrabhadra, the lord of Dummi-pura. (Pūrvadalli Dummiya gauda-pattana-svāmi-prajegalu mahā-nādu-olagāgi namage bittukottantha mūle-visadolage ardhapalavu). Likewise, a Hospet inscription of A.D.1535[9] records that Abbarāya Timmappa, the Agent of the Pradhāni Tirumala Rāya granted the mūle-visa of certain villages for the offerings of the god Tiruvengalanātha at Tirumaladēviyarapattana with the consent of the Setti-pattanasvāmis of the villages of Tirumaladēviyarapattana, Varadarājammanapattana and Krishnāpura, and of the mahānādu (General Assembly) of Dōsāvara. (Tirumaladēviyare Pattanada Setti-pattana-svāmigaligū, Varadarājammanapattanada Setti-pattanasvāmigaligū, Krishnāpurada Settipattanasvāmigaligū, Dēsāvarada sālumūle mahānādigū ....). From this inscription, we are able to draw several conclusions. Firstly, it mentions the various suburbs of Vijayanagara city, namely, Tirumaladēviyara pattana, Varadarājammana-pattana and Krishnāpura. Secondly, the influence of the local bodies and corporations such as the mahānādu was felt by the central government, whose officers could neither remit taxes nor make gifts without the consent of the former. Thirdly, the Vijayanagara government was liberal enough to acknowledge the existence of merchant-guilds, ~~and the~~

---

9. SII, IX (ii), No,573.

~~popular assemblies of villagers~~. Finally, as in the pre-Vijayanagara period, the mahānādu included the guilds of the important towns, representatives of the people of the place and the officers of the government of the region.

Inscriptions refer to an officer called mahānāḍa-prabhu. Some examples may be given of the existence of such an officer. An inscription of A.D.1505 records the grant of Biṭṭanakurike to Māchināyaka by the mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Rāmarāja Jagannātha-rājayadēvamahā-arasu and the mahānāḍa-prabhu Kempavīrappa Gavuḍa.[10] An epigraph of A.D. 1593 mentions that the mahānāḍaprabhu Bijāvara Chikapa-gauḍa's son built a fort.[11] Again, in A.D.1598, the mahānāḍaprabhu Bidyāvara-Mummaḍi-Chikkappa-Gauḍaraiya gave a grāma-umbaḷi.[12]

In A.D.1606, the mahānādu (Mahānāḍa Seṭṭi-Samastaru) assembly, throughout the kingdom ruled by Veṅkaṭappa-Nāyaka, on all the local roads, for all animals, agreed to give as dharma, visa by visa, in all the thāṇās, namely, Ikkēri Sadāśiva, Sāgara, Sirivante, Kesanūr, Tavanidhi, Gutti, Jeḍeya, Kupaṭūr, Soraba, Togarasi, Kabūr, Uduganī, Jambūr, Mahādēvapura, Kumbesi, Haranahaḷḷi, Ānandapura, Mosarūr,

10. EC, XII, Tm.107.
11. EC, XII, Mi.21.
12. Ibid., Tm.66.

Pombucha, Dānivāsa, Ārega, Durga, Āgumbe, Kōvi, Baguñji, Belare, Kalasa, Mēgunde, Kiga, Nemmāru, Muttūru, Mude, Kāru, Bidirūr, Hulikallu, Hannara, Karūru, Saulanādu, Sāvantanakatte, Bhārangi and Āvinahalli. In these and other thānas the mahānād-settis who loaded goods, by both roads to places east and north to the interior, granted for the Śiva service of the matha one visa on the stock.[13] This inscription is clear evidence of the existence of the mahānādu at least till the beginning of the 17th century.

There are references to other big assemblies which resembled the mahānādu.

(1) An inscription at Modalli in Kollegal Taluk records, that in A.D.1366, during the reign of Kampanna-odeya, son of Vīra-Bukkanna-odeya and in the administration of Perumāla-Bhatta, a certain Nāyaka made a gift of land, and a part of the toll revenue of the villages Bandehalli and Modehalli, with the consent of the nādu, nagara and nānādēśis, for the service of the god Mallināthadēva of Mudehalli. This is obviously a reference to a big assembly. (Nāda samasta nānādēśigalu; eradu nādu nādu nagara samastarum).[14]

13. EC, VIII, Sa.123.
14. SII, IX (ii), No.411.

(2) According to an inscription from Andigere village, a big assembly in A.D.1404, made a land grant. In this instance, the ruling Prabhus, the chiefmen of all the nādus of the Āraga Eighteen Kampaṇas, of all the three cities, the Rau-nāḍ four mandus, and sixty villages, and the dānamūlis of Kobade, having agreed together granted to Kallappa and Māyaṇṇa a gift of land in the Kobade village of Rau-nāḍ.[15]

(3) According to another epigraph, Appāji Sēnabhōva of Koppa (descent stated), having set up the god Gōpālakṛishṇa on the banks of the Tuṅgabhadrā in Nari in Koḍa-nāḍ bought certain specified lands and presented them for the offerings of the god. The epigraph contains the following interesting information. "Witnesses, who will see to the carrying out of this work of merit: All the nāḍ officers of Koppa-Koḍanāḍ four thousand; all the cultivators of the two Angaḍi of Koppa, the Brahmans of Bommanapura, Nāgalāpura, Narasiṁhapura and Sōmatapura.[16]

These large assemblies established agrahāras. In A.D.1405, the nāḍu people of the Eighteen Kampaṇa and all those of the three cities and the owners of the villages in the name of the Viceroy, formed an agrahāra called Mādhava-

15. EC, VIII, Tl.196.
16. EC, VI, Kp.57.

Virupāmbikāpura.[17] Similarly, in A.D.1407, when Vishthanna Odeyar still continued to govern Āraga, Tippanna-ayya, with the consent of all the nādu people of the Āraga Eighteen Kampana and all the cultivators of the three cities, sold certain specified land rated at 60 hon, in Mayise village to Bommanna-ayya to form an agrahāra.[18]

We also come across different assemblies where guilds were prominent. They resemble mahānādus but are not called so. One such assembly was entrusted with the management of a gift to a temple. In A.D.1446, during the time of Dēvarāya II, Āoharasa-Odeya ruling over Tulurājya made a grant of twelve honnus of gold to Purushōttama-bhatta who was to conduct the recital (Japa) of Dēvī-māhātmya-stōtra in the Durgā temple. The management of the gift was left in the charge of the nādu, nakhara and grāma (assemblies). The witnesses to the gift were Kānchanadāna, Baloyalasa representing the nādus, Settikāra Mana Kana-Setti on behalf of the nakhara (merchant guilds) and Dāmōdarabhatta son of Padmanābha of Sangōtōchagrāma (village assembly).[19]

Villages sent representatives to bigger assemblies. We can draw this inference from an inscription of A.D.1438

---

17. EC, VIII, Tl.105.

18. Ibid., 190.

19. Panchamukhi, R.S. Karnātak Inscriptions I, No.58 (1939-40).

which refers to the setting up of a hero-stone by a big assembly. During the time of Deva Raya, Kotianna, brother of the deceased Tirukunayaka in conjunction with the prominent seven (representatives) of the Hadavalli and Kaikini-nadus, the Samasta nadu (general assembly) of Ippattanalku-bali (the 24 divisions) and the nadu (assembly) of Manki and Siriyali set up a hero stone.[20]

The mahanadu also established fairs. An inscription of A.D.1362 deals with the joint activities of all the farmers and subjects of the great Kayivara nadu and all (of both sects Idangai and Valangai) of Nana-desis in Pekkundra, and of 18 castes in connection with the establishment of a fair at Kayivara.[21]

In A.D.1367, when Virupa Raya, son of the king Bukka Raya was the Viceroy of Araga Eighteen Kampana, "in order that Virupa Raya might have a firm kingdom", the people of the fifty-nads (of Araga Eighteen Kampana, the Gutti Eighteen Kampana and Idugundi) made a grant of land (specified) in Bandigarali village for the offerings of the god Sankara obviously of the same locality."[22] This inscription obviously, refers to mahanadu assembly, but not so called,

---

20. Ibid., No.56.
21. EC, X, Ct.95.
22. EC, VIII, Nr.34.

expressing the endearment of the people to their rulers for which they made land grants for charitable purposes. The people appear to have held certain monarchs as well as certain Viceroys in esteem, if we are to believe such inscriptions.

The mahānāḍu or the district assembly appears to have met only occasionally. Merchants participated in its meetings. Its functions were few. It does not appear to have had responsibility for the administration of the region. It had no establishment of its own nor was it necessary to have one. Its area, membership and functions were not definite.

Section 3:

The Nāḍu*: Introductory:

There was another type of territorial assembly Nāḍu which functioned in the territorial unit known by the same name. The territorial unit can be compared to modern taluks or hoblis. Like the latter, the former was also an administrative unit, and the nāḍu assembly was the assembly of a group of villages which met frequently. The fact that the people in the nāḍu formed that assembly is indicated by the use of certain expressions which will be mentioned later in our discussion of the Nāḍu Assembly. The common interests of the villages were responsible for the formation of this

---

*. Dikshit, op cit p22.

assembly. As will be seen, it had responsibility for the administration of the region including irrigation, taxation and judicial administration.

The *nāḍu* organization existed in ancient and medieval South India enjoying great powers of initiative and organization in local matters. It discharged certain specific functions like making its own laws and regulations. In this connection, Radha Kumud Mookerjee observes: "It is the quasi-instinctive postulates and conventions of group life which come to be formulated as law and not the mandate, command or decree of a single central authority in the state. Law under these conditions is not an *arte-fact* but a natural growth of consensus and communal life".[23]

The earliest reference to the *Nāḍu* in Karnataka appears to be in the Halmidi inscription of the fifth century A.D.[24] An inscription of about A.D.950 from Atkur (Mysore district) says, "The farming of that land (which was given in charity) the *nāḍu* will regulate and the village will regulate."[25] Epigraphic evidence proves that the *nāḍu* had become a self-governing unit of administration in Karnataka from the middle of the tenth century A.D.[26] The *nāḍu* continued to flourish

23. Mookerji, Radhakumud, *Nationalism in Hindu Culture*, pp.99-100.
24. ~~Dikshit, op.cit., pp.35-57.~~ *Ibid.*, MAR, 1936, No.16.
25. *EC*, III, Md.41, L 13.
26. Dikshit, *op.cit.*, pp.35-57.

in the Vijayanagara times, and as Mahalingam observes, "enjoyed similar powers as the village assembly but its jurisdiction extended over a wider area."[27] Further he says, "the nādu and the Sabhā were quasi-independent republics in the local areas managing local affairs, and bearing the responsibility for the carrying on of certain branches of the administration in the local areas."[28] But in parts of Tamil Nadu comprising parts of Trichinopoly, Tanjore and Ramanad districts and the former Pudukkotai state, there was anarchy between the 14th and the 16th centuries when local institutions lost much of their influence.[29]

Section 4:

Officers of the Nādu:

We have seen that there were officers known as Gaundas or prabhus in charge of villages. Those in charge of groups of villages or nādus or Kampanas were known as nād-gaundas, nādaprabhus.

In A.D.1419 Rāma Gāuda had the nād gaudike of some villages.[30] An inscription of the reign of Krishnadeva Raya makes a reference to the nādgaundas.[31] There appears to have

---

27. Mahalingam, Admn., pp.215-216.
28. Ibid., Admn., p.216.
29. Venkatarama Ayyar, K.P. Anarchy in a part of the Tamilnad - How the people faced it? PIHC, 1944, pp.300-305.
30. EC, XII, Mi.20.
31. EC, X, Sd.79.

been a meeting of all the nād-gauḍas of Vijayanagara to grant land.[32] In A.D.1351 the Kularvali nāḍ-prabhus were Talavāḍi Bammanna, Gangavāḍi Māḍanna and many others (named).[33] In A.D.1377 all the nāḍ-prabhus in the Nasavandunāḍ met for a charitable purpose.[34] An epigraph of A.D.1584 makes a reference to the nāḍ-prabhus (named) of Kolala.[35] A record of A.D.1404 refers to the prabhus, the chief men of the nāḍus of the Āraga-Venthe Eighteen Kampana.[36] In A.D.1525 Elavaṅka (Elahaṅka) nāḍprabhu was Kempayya Gauḍa.[37] In A.D. 1537, one Sadhipa was the Prabhu of Talakāḍanāḍu.[38] In A.D. 1543 Sitākal Gaṅgappa Nāyaka held the nāḍ-gauḍike of Kolala-Sīme.[39]

The Prabhu of a nāḍu seems to have been at times the headman of some village. For example, one Sankanna, the headman of the Piṭhamane village, the first in the Kupalūr-Twentysix of the Nāyarakhaṇḍa Malunāḍ was the Prabhu of the nāḍ.[40] Yajamān was probably another term used to denote the headship of the nāḍu. A Hosahalli (Channapatna taluk) epigraph of A.D.1527 records the grant of a field of the sowing capacity of half Khaṇḍuga to Bayirappa Nāyakkan by

32. MAR, 1925, p.19.
33. EC, IX, Cp.165.
34. EC, VIII, Tl.28.
35. EC, X, Kl.80.
36. EC, VIII, Tl.196.
37. EC, XII, Kg.23.
38. MAR, 1947-56, No.33.
39. EC, XII, Tm.59.
40. EC, VIII, Sb.265.

the nād-gaudas of Vijayapura in consideration of his holding the office of Yajamān (headmanship) of the nādu (Vijapurada aśesha nāda-gaudugalu Bayirapanāyakage Yajamāntanakke Kotta mānyada gadde).[41] An inscription at Haralu-kunte village in the Hobali of Yaldur in Kolar District, the date of which is uncertain, records the grant of the office of Svāmitana (Headmanship) of a nādu (not specified),[42] together with the gift of some plots of dry land, and of the right to collect the revenue to Venkatasetti, by the people of the nadu.

Appointment of Nadgaunda:

The practice of a nadgaunda being appointed to his office by the king as well as being elected by the people ~~which~~ prevailed in the pre-Vijayanagara times[42a] ~~appears to have continued even after~~. But in Vijayanagara times, by & large the grant of the office lay generally with the king, and the king's officers. The position was hereditary.[43]

An inscription at Maddagiri, of A.D. 1419, which was referred to before, tells us about "the gauda's Kodagemānye granted to Singe Gauda's son Rāma Gauda, Maddagirihalli, and under the Vōdina channel space for 2000 areca trees, with nād-gaudike in each village".[44] The grant was caused to be written by Aubhala-Rāya-Vodeyar. The inscription does not mention the nature of the office held by him.

---

41. MAR, 1925, No.5.
42. Ibid., No.100. 42a Ibid
43. EC, VII, Sk.219.
44. EC, XII, Mi.20.

In A.D.1543, Bayirappa Nāyakayya's agents Kampanna Nāyaka and Nandyapa Nāyaka granted to Sitakal Gangappa Nayaka to whom reference was made before for the nād-gaudike a village and inscribed on stone as follows:

> "Having given the nād-gaudike of the Kolala-Sime which was favoured as their magani by Achyuta Mahārāya, we grant you freedom from tax for dry and wet fields in all the villages of this Sime, and as a dandige umbali we grant you Vommachihalli belonging to the Kolala-nād Sime, together with all rights" (specified as a permanent endowment).[45] It is clear from this inscription that the king's officers also appointed the nād-gaunda.

During the reign of Venkatapati Deva Mahārāya the Mahārājakāchārya (with other epithets) Harati Immadi Rangappa Nāyakayya's (son) Hungahati Nāyaka's family relatives and others (named) granted to the nād-gaudas a stone śāsana as follows:

> "Whereas according to the copper Śāsana formerly given by Vira Ballāla Raya the nād-gaudike was being carried on, and Mudi-Gauda ...... of the two tanks says that the nād-gaudike is his, and having sent those on his side to Tumkūr, and they and Mudi Gowda

---

45. EC, XII, Tm.59.

having had a false Vōle written, came saying that they had gained the (case) - And whereas the channel Overseer's Vōle was a false Vōle having been proved by the men sent from our palace, they returned the Vōle, saying that we will not submit to Mudi Gauḍa and that the Gauḍike did not belong to him, - Thereupon to Anegonda Karinigappa they deposed that as long as the Sun and the Moon endure there should be no joint gauḍike or substitute, and in the presence of the chief priest of the god Meḷikunṭe Bālakriṣhṇa's temple, set up this stone śāsana."[46]

This is an interesting case of settling the question of false claims put forwardto a gauḍike in A.D.1612. From this inscription we can draw the following conclusions: Firstly, a nāḍ-gauḍike could be granted by a king. The inscription clearly states that it was first granted by Vīra Ballāḷa Rāya and then continued by Vijayanagara rulers. Secondly, it throws light on the hereditary nature of the office. Until the dispute arose it was held in a hereditary manner. Thirdly, Gaudikes were sold like other commodities. In this connection mention may be made of an inscription of A.D.1581 according to which one Siddaṇṇa-gauḍa of Sid(dh)a-pura sold the gauḍike which belonged to him of Roṭṭehaḷḷi for

46. EC, XII, Si.84.

200 Varaha, to Medakeri Nāyaka, grandson of the Mahānāyakā-chārya Kamegeti Segale Hanume Nāyaka.[47] Fourthly, the nad-gaudike continued in Vijayanagara times, and finally, when the dispute arose in 1612 during the reign of Venkatapati Deva Mahārāya it was settled by the Mahānāyakāchārya's son's family relatives and others.

Nādgaunda's remuneration:

In the Tamil districts, the performance of specific services was remunerated by the grant of land under the Umbali tenure (a rent-free land granted to persons of public service). In the Kannada districts grants of land made for a particular purpose were known as Kodage or Kudangai. A dandige Umbali in some instances was granted for the gaudike of a nādu. We have referred to the epigraph of A.D.1543 in which Sitākal Ganngappa Nāyaka was granted for the nād-gaudike of the Kolala Sīme, freedom from tax for dry and wet fields in all the villages of the sīme and as a dandige-umbali, Vommachahalli with all rights (specified) as a permanent endowment.[48]

We meet with a variety of mānya grants such as Kodage mānya, puri-mānya, kattu-kodage, and dayinya-kodago, ~~satige-kodage and netharu-kodage~~s. We have referred earlier to an

47. EC, XI, Cd.48.
48. EC, XII, Tm.59.

inscription of A.D.1419 regarding a Kodage-manya grant to Rama Gouda in Maddagirihalli, space for 2000 areca trees.[49] From these examples it is clear that for the nadgaudike sometimes a dandige umbali village was granted as a permanent endowment with all rights. Sometimes a variety of manya grant was given.

We get all the emoluments of a nad-gaunda from ~~the~~ an undated Haralukunte inscription in the Hobali of Yaldur in Kolar District. It says that he was given by the people ~~by k~~ of his nadu, land of the sowing capacity of half a Khanduga and the right to collect the revenue (aya a kind of tax), manepattu, house tax and tolls on merchandise.[50] According to the Honneyakere inscription of A.D.1307, the nadheggade was given, "one pana from each of 40 villages half a pana from each of 30 villages and toll etc. of the fair.[51] These records are of interest as they show the nature of power exercised by the people of the nadu collectively in appointing the headman, the importance of the office of headmanship, and the headman's remuneration. From the instances cited above, we can infer that the nadgaunda's remuneration came from 1) Manya land, 2) aya or fee, 3) Toll on merchandise and 4) a house tax.

---

49. EC, XII, Mi.20.
50. MAR, 1925, p.82.
51. EC, XI, Hk.137.

<u>Functions of the Nāḍgauṇḍa</u>:

It can be presumed that his functions were the same as in the preceeding period.[52] An inscription of A.D.1017, says, 'we the inhabitants of Kaivāranāḍu bind ourselves to give one goat (or sheep), on every Tuesday, to Chāmuṇḍēśvarī, the guardian deity of this <u>nāḍu</u>, and the <u>gāmuṇḍa</u> of this <u>nāḍu</u>, shall be held responsible for this gift.'[53] His functions included the collection of taxes, construction of tanks, administration of justice and some miscellaneous functions, such as looking after the temples in his charge. He was the chairman of the <u>nāḍu</u> assembly. Here is an instance of the good work done by the <u>nāḍu</u> officers. An inscription of A.D.1342 records "All the subjects and chiefs (<u>Prajegāvuṇḍa</u>) and the <u>mahāsāvantādhipati</u> (with other titles) Chikka Bayiraya Nāyaka's son Honna Vaya Nāyaka granted ... specified land at Jakkur to the <u>nāḍ-Sēnabōva</u> Allāḷa as a <u>sarvamānya-Kodage</u> (a grant to be respected by all).[54]

Inscriptions refer to a <u>nāḍu</u> officer namely, the superintendent (<u>nāṭṭu-nāyakan</u>). An inscription dated A.D. 1346 informs us that Harihara Oḍeyar and Bukkaṇṇa Oḍeyar granted to Vaiyaṇṇan Komuppan, the superintendent over the Tekkalnāḍu, Māḍaraisanpaḷḷi belonging to the same <u>nāḍu</u> as

52. Dikshit, <u>op.cit.</u>, pp.40-44.
53. <u>EC</u>, X, Kl.26.
54. <u>EC</u>, IX, Bn.21.

a *Kudangai* exempt from taxes. The grant further states that he was to grow any crop he pleased on all the dry and wet lands of the village excluding former gifts, and that he was entitled to receive all the villages (specified) in perpetuity.[55] In A.D.1360, the inhabitants of the *nādu* including the superintendents of the *nādu* (nāttu - nāyakan) and three others met.[56] In A.D.1379, the *Mahāsāvantādhipati* Sonnaiya Nāyakar's son Ankaya Nāyaka was the superintendent over the Nondaguli-nādu.[57] In A.D.1380, we have the *Senabova* Modisiyar Kambayar as the superintendent over the Erumarai-nādu.[58] Further, in A.D.1385 Turavar Nambiravi Settiyar was the superintendent over the Puliyūr-nādu.[59] It is clear from these inscriptions that the superintendent was a dignitary who was in charge of a *nādu*. It is possible that the superintendent may have been the *nadgaunda* himself. We also come across the office of *Yajamāna*. In 1527-28, as will be clear from the inscription Bayirappa Nāyaka was holding the office of *Yajamāna* of the *nādu*.[60] There are also examples of a *nādu* having a chief. A Kudagere inscription of A.D.1377 makes a reference to the *nādu* chiefs[61] (*nāda samasta gauda-prabhugalu*). It records that all the Brahmans of the two Kannūr *agrahāras* in Harahalinad

55. *EC*, X, Mr.39.
56. *Ibid.*,
57. *EC*, IX. Ht.50.
58. *Ibid.*, An.28.
59. *Ibid.*, Ht.93.
60. *MAR*, 1925, p.19.
61. *EC*, VII, Sk.35.

and of Edihalli and Gavalūr, and of the seventy villages, and all the gaudas and chiefs of the nādu made a grant of rice land (specified) belonging to the Gautama village for the God Narasimha of the hillof the same locality. The same epigraph informs us that Kondamani Rāmaya Nāyaka's son Tala Nāyaka and the Brahmans of Harahali-nādu having made application to the nādu chiefs transferred it with pouring of water. Another epigraph of A.D.1512 from Kunthūru in Kollegal Taluk, makes mention of various taxes and of the boundaries of villages situated in Hadināḍ, which the chief Immaḍi Chikkarāya Oḍeya was ruling.[62] It is possible that the nād-prabhus, Yajamānas, and superintendents (nāttu-nayakan) might be the same as nād-gaundas.

The nād-Sēnabōvas appear to have been officials of considerable influence. Just as they had a Sēnabōva over a village they had also one over the nādu. The nād-sēnabōva had to maintain what may be called the revenue register of the nādu. (1) A record of A.D.1346 contains the signature of the nādu accountant Nilappan.[63] (2) An inscription of A.D.1392 of the time of Harihara Rāya II which gives us the details of rents in Mādharahalli and the neighbouring places, and of the award of 215 Varaha, two hana to Rāmachandra

62. SII, IX (ii), No.701.
63. EC, X, Sd.67.

Oḍeyar "according to the accounts of the *nāḍ-syānabhōva* Sāyappa".[64] (3) In A.D.1404 the *Senabōva* of Mudavanka-*nāḍu* was Siṅgarasa.[65] (4) In A.D.1405 the *nāḍ-senabōvs* of Āraga-Vēṇṭe was Narahari Dēva.[66]

Section 5:

The Nāḍu Assembly:

The assembly was known as the *Nāḍu*. Broadly speaking, the *nāḍu* assemblies consisted of 1) Headmen of the villages forming the *nāḍu* and officers of the *nāḍu*. 2) Representatives of the inhabitants of the *nāḍu*, and 3) the merchant guilds and the *agrahāras* of the *nāḍu*. ~~It is difficult to delineate the constitution of the nāḍu for administrative purposes.~~ Obviously, all the residents in a *nāḍu* could not have been its members. Probably the more influential among them served on the *nāḍu*.[67] This view is proved by the fact that in mentioning the decisions and resolutions of the *Nāḍu* assemblies, only a section of the people of the *nāḍu* have attested their signatures. This is a type of *nāḍu* assembly which included representatives of the inhabitants of the *nāḍu*. A few examples of such assemblies follow:

1) In A.D.1346 the inhabitants of Ambadakki-nāḍu including one Pappisiyar and six others made a grant. The attestation

64. EC, XI, Hr.36 and 39.
65. EC, VIII, Tl.134.
66. EC, VIII, Tl.22.
67. Mahalingam, SIP, pp.359-360.

was made by Śettīśvaradēvar Nīlappaṉ, the accountant of the nāḍu and a few others.[68] Their signatures constituted the signature of the nāḍu.

2) In A.D.1347 the same nāḍu assembly made a land grant, and it contains the signature of Śettīśvaradēvar, and Śrī Allālanāṭṭa Nīlappan, the accountant of the nāḍu as the signature of the nāḍu.[69]

3) In A.D.1361, Vallappadeṇṇāyakkar and the inhabitants of Vēpūr-nāḍu, Śokkayappan and others made a grant.[70]

4) In A.D.1363 the nāḍu meeting consisted of the elders of the three cities and the Eighteen Kampanas.[71]

5) An epigraph dated A.D.1400 relates that a Śāsana was given by all the people of the (Ma)ndu-nāḍ thirty.[72] It is likely that in the assembly of Mandu-nāḍ, thirty villages were represented.

6) An inscription of A.D.1405 makes mentionof the sale of land by the nāḍu people of the Eighteen Kampana, all those of the three cities and of the villages. (Hadineṇṭu Kampaṇadavaru mūru paṭṭaṇada halavaru āgrāmagaḷa mūligaru sahita).[73] The word mūligaru obviously refers to some

68. EC, X, Sd.67.
69. Ibid., 71.
70. EC, IX, Bn.101.
71. EC, VIII, Tl.197.
72. Ibid., 115.
73. Ibid., 105.

important men or leaders.

Another expression used to indicate that the assembly was attended by influential men representing the locality is Janni. For example, in A.D.1432, a land grant was made by the seven Jannis of the Nadu.[74] Again an epigraph A.D.1438 refers to nadelumandi[75] (i.e., seven members of the nadu assembly).

We have instances where the nadu assembly consisted of the headmen of the villages ~~of the nadu~~ headmen as well as of the head of the Nadu. A few examples of such meetings may be given:-

1) In A.D.1377 all the nad-prabhus in the Nasavandu-nad met.[76]

2) In A.D.1404 the ruling Prabhus, the chiefmen of the nadus of Araga-Venthe Eighteen Kampana, of all the three cities, the Rau-nad, and sixty villages and the Dena-mulas of Kobade met.[77]

3) In A.D.1415, the Heggades of all the nads and three cities of Araga Eighteen Kampana met.[78]

4) Further, in A.D.1527-8, all the nad-gaudas of Vijayanagara met.[79] It is clear from these instances that the nadu

---

74. Panchamukhi, R.S. Karnatak Inscriptions, I, 51 of 1939-40.
75. Ibid., 56 of 1939-40.
76. EC, VIII, Tl.28.
77. Ibid., 196.
78. Ibid., 217.
79. MAR, 1925, p.19.

assembly consisted of the headmen of the villages of the nādu ~~and along with them the nādu headman~~ as well as of the head of the Nādu

The nādu assembly sometimes included the merchant guilds and the agrahāras of the nādu.

1) In A.D.1362 the farmers and subjects of the great Kayivāranādu and all (of both sects Idangai and Valangai) of Nānā-dēsis in Pekkundra, and of eighteen castes met.[80]

2) An assembly in Sātalige-nādu consisted of the residents of the nine agrahāras and the 1005 land owners of Sātalige.[81]

3) In A.D. 1377 all the Brahmans of the two Kannūr agrahāras in Harahalināḍ and of Edihalli and Gavalūr, and of the seventy villages and all the gaudas and chiefs of the nādu met.[82]

4) The mahānāyakāchārya Timmaṇa-Nāyaka of Nidugal, the gaudas and sēnabōvas of Nidugalla-sīme together with the merchants made a gift.[83] This is also an example of a nādu which was attended by others in addition to the regular members.

Section 6:

Meetings of the Nādu Assembly:

The nādu assembly met generally in its ~~the~~ chāvadi or hall.

---

80. EC, X, Ct.95.
81. MAR, 1916, para 99.
82. EC, VII, Sk.35.
83. SII, IX (ii), No.665.

One such meeting took place in A.D. 1363 in the Āraga Chāvadi.[84] There is a reference to another such meeting.[85] Sometimes it met in a maṇḍapa.[86]

An officer of the government could summon the nāḍu assembly. In A.D.1371-2 under orders from Kampana Oḍeyar himself, presided over by the king's officer Tuṇaiyirunda-nambi Koṅgarāyar, the nāḍu assembly gathered.[87] Sāvaṇṇa Oḍeyar sent for Arasaṇṇa Heggaḍe and Vīra Heggaḍe of Melub-āgilu in the Mēlubhāgi of the Sātaḷige-nāḍu and convened a meeting of the residents of the nine agrahāras and the 1005 landowners of Sātaḷige.[88] The mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Rāmarāja-Tirumalarājayya dēva-Mahāarasu summoned the Niḍugalla-sīme assembly to which we referred before.[89] The meetings of the nāḍu could be summoned either by officers of the government or some benefactor of the nāḍu.

There are also instances of the nāḍu assembly meeting of its own accord.

1) In A.D.1362, the farmers and subjects of the great Kayivāra-nāḍu and the nānā-dēśis in Pekkundra, and eighteen castes met to establish a fair at Kayivāra.[90]

---

84. EC, VIII, Tl.197.
85. MAR, 1916, para 99.
86. 196 of 1912.
87. Ibid.,
88. MAR, 1916, p.60.
89. SII, IX (ii), No.665.
90. EC, X, Ct.95.

2) In A.D.1390 the nād-prabhus of Koḷala (several named) and other men granted lands in dharma.[91] Witnesses appear to have been necessary on such occasions. The signatures of the donor and of the witnesses were affixed to it.

3) In 1415 the Heggades of all the nāḍus and three cities of the Āraga Eighteen Kampaṇa met for a sale of land.[92]

4) In A.D.1427 certain Heggaḍes (named) of Śāntaḷige and all the people of the nāḍu gave a sale deed.[93]

Section 7:

Functionsof the Nāḍu Assembly:

Remission of Taxes:

The influence of the local bodies and corporations was felt by the central government, whose officers usually remitted taxes and made gifts with the consent of the former.

1) In A.D.1365 a certain Nāyaka made a gift of land and a part of toll revenue of the villages Baṇḍehaḷḷi and Mōḍehaḷḷi with the consent of the nāḍu for the service of the god Mallināthadēva of Mōḍehaḷḷi.[94]

2) Two inscriptions of the time of Bukka's son Vīra-Bhūpāla record exemptions granted by the local bodies (Nāṭṭār and

91. EC, X, Kl.105.
92. EC, VIII, Tl.217.
93. EC, VI, Kp.27.
94. SII, IX (ii), No.411.

Uravar) of Adanur of all the taxes due from certain hamlets, belonging to the temple or purchased by the donors on its behalf, for money received by it from the several donors, under the orders of the king's officials.[95] In this case the nadu assembly acted as a link between the central government and the different localities. Thus in Tamilnad also there is mention of the activities of the Nadu or Nattavar who represented a political division. The Nattavar were the members of the Nadu.

3) During the time of Deva Raya I, in A.D.1410, the Nattavar of Palangur-Parru and Mudipanur-Parru remitted certain taxes on devadana lands at Meyyur in order to provide for worship, festivals and repairs in the temple.[96]

4) An inscription found at the Madhavesvara temple in Hariharapura in Koppa Taluk records, that in A.D.1418 a meeting of the residents of the nine agraharas and the 1008 land owners of Satalige was called to make a distribution of the tenants paying assessment to the Pratapahariharapura agrahara so that there might not arise any trouble between the government servants and those of the villages constituting the agrahara. Savanna who called the meeting asked Arasanna-Heggade and Vira-Heggade to distribute the tenants.

95. 125 and 126 of 1933-1934.
96. 404 of 1938.

This was done, and a patte or roll of assessment stating that these tenants were not to be molested either by the king or the nadu for any loss that might accrue.[97] In this instance, in the presence of the nadu, details of Okkalu or tenants paying assessment were given to the mahajanas of the agrahara.

5) In A.D.1421, one Vijayalayadeva of Suraikkudi endowed 100 panams to the local temple. This amount had to be deducted every year by the Nattavar of Atalaiyurnadu from the revenues due to the chieftain.[98] The Nattavar had thus the power of remitting some of the local taxes due to them.

6) An inscription from Tiruvaigavur dated A.D.1429 records that during the time of Deva Raya II, there was an agreement between the Nattavar of Parantakanadu and the Valangai and the Idangai 98 sects regarding the payment of Rajagaram dues to the king.[99]

7) An epigraph of A.D.1443 from Srimushnam informs us that the Nattar and the Tantrimar of Irungolappadinadu made a joint gift of certain taxes payable by the tenants living in the Tirumadavilagam of the Siva and Vishnu temples for conducting a service called the Periyanattansandi.[100]

97. MAR, 1916, para 99.
98. IPS, 699.
99. 59 of 1914.
100. 230 of 1916.

8) An inscription of A.D.1443 from Tiruvarattural mentions that the Nattar and Tantrimar of the 18 Parrus assigned the taxes collected from the people residing in the madavilagam for instituting a service in the temple.[101]

9) A record from Pennadam in the present South Arcot district informs us, that during the time of Mallikarjuna the Nadu assembly of Vadatundanadu made a gift of taxes on some lands to the temple for offerings and worship.[102]

10) In A.D.1523, a dharmasasana remitting the marriage tax was set up in the Kundalagudike village of the Malalur-Sthala, belonging to the Nallurnad. The remission was made in the presence of all the nad-gaundas.[103]

11) An epigraph from Lakshmesvar, Shirhatti Taluk, Dharwar District, dated A.D.1547 registers the exemption from the marriage tax granted to the agrahara Huligere at the request of the nadagaudas and others of Huligere. The nadagaudas and others of Huligere (Huligereya nadagavuda orulegalu Setti pattanasvamigalu muntada ......) deputed Linqisetti to request the king for the exemption which was granted.[104]

Settlement of Boundaries:

We come across instances of the settlement of boundaries

---

101. 215 of 1928-1929.
102. 257 of 1928-1929.
103. EC, X, Sd.79.
104. SII, XX, 238.

between villages and fields and the regulation of water for irrigation purposes in the presence of the nāḍu-people.

1) In A.D.1363, in the time of Virupaṇṇa Oḍeyar, the great minister Nāgaṇṇa and other arasus (named) settled a complicated question between the people of Heddūr-sīme and the temple āchāryas on the one hand and the Jaina Sūris on the other. The presence of the nāḍu people was necessary during such occasions.[105]

2) An effaced epigraph dated A.D. 1400 relates that a Śāsana was given for the Mahant of ...... by all the people of the (Ma)□ndunāḍ thirty in connection with a dispute regarding boundary stones. The Mahant and the nāḍu making inquiry decided that the stones had been unjustly put up and could not be allowed.[106]

Administration of Justice:

Some instances of the administration of justice deal with the settlement of disputes by the officers of the government with the cooperation of local bodies. We have referred to the dispute inthe Tirthahalli taluk in A.D. 1363 in the reign of Bukka Oḍeyar which was settled amicably. The people of Heddūr-nāḍ and the temple āchāryas disputed

---

105. EC, VIII, Tl.197.
106. Ibid., Tl.115.

with the Sūris as to the boundaries of the land belonging to the Pārśvadēva temple of Tadatala in Heddūr-nāḍ. The great minister Nāgaṇṇa and various important officials like Pradhāna Dēvarāja, along with other arasus or lords, and the Jaina Mallappa summoned the elders of the three cities and the Eighteen Kampaṇas and held an enquiry in the Āraga chāvadi or hall, "and having made the nāḍu agree they fixed the boundaries (specified) according to the former custom as those of the temple endowment of Pārśvadēva." 107

Two inscriptions from Lakshmēśvar in Shirhatti Taluk in Dharwar District give us an insight into the dispensation of justice. The epigraph dated A.D.1412 of the time of Dēvarāya I refers to a dispute regarding the land between Hēmadēvāchārya of Śaṅkha-basti at Huligeṛe (modern Lakshmēśvar) and Śivarāmayya, the āchārya of the Sōmadēva temple at the same place. Both the parties claimed the land on behalf of their temples. The dispute was referred to Mahāpradhāna Nāgaṇṇa-daṇḍanāyaka at whose command Purōhita Saṅgamadēva and the learned men of the palace were required to study the documents of both the parties and decide the issue. The learned judges first obtained the promise of the parties in writing that they would abide by their decision. Then, after studying the necessary documents

---

107. Ibid., Tl.197.

and after ascertaining from Nāgagauḍa and other subjects (*Gauḍaprajes*) of the place as to which party was enjoying the land from the time of king Harihara, they settled the dispute in favour of Hēmadēvāchārya.

The evidence of documents was found necessary and valuable for the decision of the issue. The documents that they studied included the *Śāsanas* ~~and [illegible]~~. The *gauḍa prajes* were consulted which shows the democratic spirit displayed by the learned men in deciding disputes. They took into consideration *pūrvamaryāde* and they also extracted a promise from both the parties that they should not raise a controversy over it after their decision.[108]

The other inscription dated A.D.1538 registers a deed of settlement of a dispute between the Jainas of the same Śaṅkha-basti and the Brahmanas of the same temple of Sōmēśvara-dēva regarding the use of certain honours like *dhvaja, patāka*, etc., which had been misappropriated by the Jains for their deity. In this case, the Jainas gave a *jaya-patra* to the other party and regretted for their action.[109]

Temple Affairs:

Nāḍu representatives sometimes settled details of the internal economy of a temple.

---

108. *SII*, XX, No.232.
109. *Ibid*., No.391.

1) In A.D.1371-72 the assembly composed of the dignitaries of the Tiruverriyūr temple, Chingleput district, met under orders of Kampana Odeya, presided over by the king's officer Turaiyirundanambi Kongarayar. The trustees (of the temple) and the district representatives (nāttār) had gathered. The questionof the right of procedure in the temple service was thoroughly thrashed out and settled.[110]

2) Another epigraph refers to the judgment of Tirumalanāyaka concerning the dispute between the Sthānikas or temple managers themselves of the Kāmēśvara temple at Āragalūr. The nāttār, that is, the representatives of the nādu appear to have volunteered to settle the question of enjoyment called the parties to present themselves - the managers were to be present and carry out the decision arrived at by the nāttār. Tirumalanāyaka and the nāttār together advised the parties to put their case before the mahājanas and issued an order to this effect in obedience to the order the mahājanas of the agrahāras of Kulattūr, Alambalam, Śadaiyan-pattu and Mattiyakurichchi met together, heard both sides and decided it.[111]

Land gifts to temples:

The Nādu Assembly made land gifts to temples.

---

110. 196 of 1912.
111. 413 of 1913.

1) In A.D. 1343 Periya-Pemmaya-nāyakkar granted for the god Aruḷāḷanāḍār of Tekkal, certain specified lands including the wells and the trees underground, as a sarvamānya to provide for offerings of rice, sandal, lamps, garlands, temples repairs and other various requirements, and made them over to the temple authorities. The inhabitants of the nāḍu pledged themselves to maintain the above lands as a Sarvamānya. The epigraph contains the signatures of four of the inhabitants of the nāḍu.[112]

2) In A.D.1346, the inhabitants of Ambedakkināḍu including Pappi-Siyar and six others, and the mahāsāmantādhipati Mañjayanāyaka's son Aṅkaya-nāyakkar granted all the wet and dry lands belonging to Anūr as a Sarvamānya to Kadalidevar, in order to provide for the worship and offerings of rice in the temple of Irājēndra-Śōḻa-Tekkīśvaram-Udaiya-nāyanār at Śeṅgai. This epigraph contains the signatures of Śeṭṭīśvaradēvar Nīlappan, the accountant of the nāḍu and the signatures of a few more persons as the signature of the nāḍu.[113]

3) In A.D.1359, the Nāṭṭavar of Tirukkōyilūrpaṟṟu made a gift of land to Dēvapperumāḷ.[114]

---

112. EC, X, Ma.20.
113. Ibid., Sd.67.
114. 193 of 1934-35.

4) A Haradanahalli record in Chamarajanagar Taluk, dated A.D.1368 states that certain gaudas of Uyyamahalli in Yenne-nād, all the Brahmans of Kēsavapura or Nagara, and certain gaudas of various villages, made a grant of the gift from each family, the petty taxes, the tanks and lands of Mātruhalli. Agreeing among themselves, voluntarily, in the presence of the officer Siriyanna, they granted them to the god Anilēsvara of Haradanahalli.[115]

5) In A.D.1369, the Nāttavar of Tiruvayapādi in Magadaimandalam instituted the seventh day festival in the Siva temple Tiruppālepandal.[116]

6) An epigraph of A.D.1369 registers a gift of land in the village Bālehalli by Mādarasa Odeyar, chief minister of Virupannodeyar, for the service of food offerings in the temple of Vīrēsvara in the village Bālehalli in Sūlalige-nād district. He seems to have obtained this land after satisfying the inhabitants of the nadu (nada Santanisi). [117]

7) It was with the approval of the nāttar at Ponpatti that in A.D.1372 Kampana made a gift of a jewel to the temple of Deivachilai-Perumāl.[118]

8) Another gift made by Kampana to the temple at Tiruppullani was made at the request of the Nāttar who met

115. EC, IV, Ch.113.
116. 163 of 1904.
117. MAR, 1932, No.44.
118. 617 of 1902.

together in the Kāṅgayanhall.[119]

9) In A.D.1377, all the Brahmans of the two Kannūr agrahāras in Harahalināḍ, and of Eḍḍihalli and Gavalūr, and of the 70 villages, and all the gauḍas and chiefs of the nāḍu made a grant of rice land belonging to the Gautama village for the god Narasiṁha of the hill of the Gautama village.[120]

10) In A.D.1385 a certain Rājarājar and the inhabitants of the nāḍu, including the superintendent of the nāḍu, made a grant of certain lands and all kinds of taxes for the god Varadarājan of Pulliyūr.[121]

11) An epigraph dated A.D.1408 records the gift of the village Masanahalli in Banagavādi with all rights for the services of decorations to the god, festivals and perpetual lamp in the temple of Mallikārjunadēvaru in Gajanūr. The donors were the prajegāvuṇḍas of Uduvankanāḍ (Uduvankanāḍa samasta Prajegāvuṇḍugaḷu).[122]

12) In A.D.1556, the mahānāyakāchārya Niḍugal Timmanna-Nāyaka, in the presence of all the subjects of Niḍugal granted a village for the offerings, worship and festivals of the god. (Niḍugala Samasta Prajegaḷu Gavuḍa Prajegaḷu

---

119. 114 of 1903.
120. EC, VII, Sk.35.
121. EC, IX, Ht.93.
122. MAR, 1931, No.57.

Settipattana svāmigalu sahitavāgi).[123]

This is corroborated by another inscription of the same year. It says that the mahānāyakāchārya Nidugal Timmannanāyaka, and subjects of the Nidugal Sīme, with the Settipattanasvāmi, having purchased the Tumukunte village in the Nidugal kingdom granted it for the services and festivals of the god, with all the usual rights.[124]

Endowments to Temples:

The nādu people sometimes made joint endowments in the form of taxes, cash and goods to temples from patriotic and religious motives.

1) In A.D.1366, Kālappa, the gauda of Honganūr, the mahājanas of the village and the gavudugal of the nādu having met together granted some lands and taxes to provide for dancing girls in the temple of god Ankanātha.[125]

2) In A.D.1368, the great lords of Tagadūr, with all the farmers and residents of the nādu, especially the Kōvas and Kommas made an agreement that, in lieu of the 120 pagōdas which were paid for the perpetual lamp and for the liveli-hood of the servant and the feelowerman of that god Mūlasthāna

123. EC, XII, Pg.40.
124 Ibid, Si.31
125. MAR, 1917, p.47.
~~125. EC, III, Nl.117.~~

from the temple endowments received by the tammadi (or resident priest), they would themselves pay 120 pagodas (for the purpose) to the palace every year.[126]

3) The Nattavar at Kalla-Kurichi made an annual gift of 12 Kalams of oil for a perpetual lamp and for torches on festival days in the temple of Ulaganallūr.[127]

4) In A.D.1399 the Nattavar of Tenkonādu made an endowment to the Śiva temple at Tirukkōkarnam.[128]

5) According to an epigraph dated A.D.1449 the Nattavar of Kāngeyanādu (Coimbatore District) made a gift of six gold coins to the Vināyaka temple when one Kampayya Nāyaka was the agent of Mallikārjuna Rāya.[129]

The Nattavar accepted endowments for various services to the temple.

1) According to an inscription of A.D.1421, one Vijayālaya-dēva of Śuraikkudi endowed 100 panams to the local temple. This amount was to be deducted every year by the nattavar of Atalaiyūr-nadu from the revenues due to the chieftain.[130]

2) In A.D.1446, Acharsa-odeya, Mahāpradhāna ruling over Tulurājya, from his capital Bārakūru made a grant of 12

---

126. EC, III, Nj.117.
127. 177 of 1941.
128. IPS, No.691.
129. 216 of 1920.
130. IPS, No.699.

honnus (gold) in Purushottama-bhatta to conduct the recital of Devimahatmyastotra. The management of the gift was in charge of the nadu, nakhara and grama (assemblies).[131]

3) In A.D.1462 the Nattavar of Karkurichi agreed to accept an endowment for various services to the Siva temple at Tirukkattalai near Pudukkottai from Sriranga Pallavarayan of Perungalur.[132]

4) During the time of Krishnadeva Raya, two inscriptions of the years A.D.1520 and 1523 refer to the Nattavar of Vallanadu selling lands to the temple at Tiruvarangulam for paying off their dues to the Vijayanagara government.[133] This is clear evidence to prove that the nadu assembly continuedto function during the reign of Krishnadeva Raya.

Appaji Senabova of Koppa, having set up the god Gopalakrishna on the banks of the Tungabhadra in Nari in Koda-nad bought certain specified lands and presented them for the offerings of the god. The inscription contains the following interesting information:-

> Witnesses, who will see to the carrying out of this work of merit:- All the nad officers of Koppa-kodenad Four thousand; all the cultivators of the two Angadi of Koppa, the Brahmans (Mahajanas) of

---

131. Panchamukhi, Karnatak Inscriptions, I No.58.
132. IPS, No.711.
133. Ibid., Nos.733 and 737.

Bommanapura, Nāgalāpura, Narasiṁhapura, Belgula new agrahāra, Maṅgalapura and Sōmalāpura". The agreement was written with the approval of both parties by Saṅkappa Sēnabōva of Koḍanāḍ, with the signatures of the donor and of the witnesses affixed to it.[134] In this case, the endowment was made by the officials of the government. It is clear from this epigraph that corporate bodies might not always have been forced to make endowments by the officials of the government.

Land Grants for Charitable Purposes:

There are numerous records which contain land grants for charitable purposes.

1) In A.D.1341 the inhabitants of the nāḍu including Pappiśīyar, the superintendent of Ambadakkināḍu and others (three named) granted to two persons, one of whom was Tēvapperumāḷtādar (the name of the other person is effaced in the inscription except for the letters Pe ..... dar), the village of Attigapaḷḷi in Ambadakki-nāḍu, giving it the name of Vēṭṭappan-Attigapaḷḷi.[135]

2) The inhabitants of Puḷḷiyūr-nāḍu, including Turavar-

134. EC, VI, Kp.57.
135. EC, X, Sd.26.

nāyan, Tambiravi-śeṭṭiyār and others (five named) granted in A.D.1342 as a kuḍangai, certain lands to Śiyanan, son of the superintendent of Puḷḷiyūr-nāḍu.[136]

3) An inscription of A.D.1346 deals with the public charities of the paṭṭa-viyāpāri Muttiyaraśan Ilāman Suvāsa-Nāyakkar and the inhabitants of Tenkarru-Turavaḷi-nāḍu in Śanainādu of Rājendraśoḷa-vaḷa-nāḍu in Nigarili-śoḷa-maṇḍalam. They granted certain lands (specified) together with the right to sell or mortgage to Gangādhara, a resident of Śenji-agaram in Toṇḍa-maṇḍalam.[137]

4) In A.D.1347, the inhabitants of Ambadakki-nāḍu including Papoi-Śīyar and three others (named) and the mahāsāmantādhipati Mañjaya-nāyakka's son Aṅkaya-nāyakkar, granted to Keṭṭi-Śīyar, as a kuḍangai, exempt from taxes, all the wet and dry lands belonging to Dasaiyapalli of that nāḍu. The record contains the signature of Seṭṭiśvaradevar as the signature of the nāḍu and that of Nāyakkar-Śrī Allāḷanātha Nilappan, the accountant of the nāḍu.[138]

5) In A.D.1360, the mahāsāmantādhipati Śīpati-nāyaka's son Sonneya-nāyakkar and the inhabitants of Ambadakki-nāḍu, including the superintendent of the nāḍu, Papachchīyar, Śokki-śīyar and others granted certain lands as a kuḍangai exempt from taxes. This record also contains the signature of the inhabitants of the nāḍu represented by the

136. EC, IX, Ht.90.
137. Ibid., Bn.59.
138. EC, X, Sd.71.

signature of Śeṭṭāśvaram-uḍayyār, and the accountant of the nāḍu Nilappan who wrote it.[139]

6) In A.D.1361, the inhabitants of Periya-nāḍu made a grant of the wet and dry lands belonging to Tannichchai-palliṣpuram as a sarvamānya to Vīrappa.[140]

7) During the time of Kampaṇa Oḍeyar, who was placed over Mulbāgal in A.D.1363, his son Kāmaiya Nāyaka granted lands in Beḷavaṭṭa, a sub-division of Torevolinādu, in the presence of the farmers of the kingdom as a sarvamānya koḍage to Elahanka-nāḍ Allāḷa Jīya's son Tanniyappa.[141]

8) In A.D.1367 all the gauḍas and subjects of Mandunāḍu Thirty granted specified lands to Sākaṇṇa's son Dēvappa.[142] Further, in A.D.1371 all the nad people of the four Mandu-nāḍu thirty, which is here stated to be in Maduvanka-nāḍ, granted the lands of Mangala village, excluding those belonging to the god, to Sūrya Bhaṭṭa's son Maharasa in order that he might attain the four objects of human desire, and also the land in Baḍagare-yakere (specified), from affection for Umā-Mahēśvara.[143] Further, in A.D. 1379, the gauḍas and subjects of the two Mandu-nāḍu thirty (many named) and five original landowners of Niṭṭūr (named), granted to Mallappa of the treasury, lands in the Niṭṭūr village, rated at

139. Ibid., Ct.75.
140. Ibid., Kl.203.
141. EC, IX, Bn.59.
142. EC, VIII, Tl.120.
143. Ibid., Tl.119.

fourteen hon.[144]

9) An epigraph of A.D.1396 registers the gift of some lands situated in the common land of the village Titisarigada Subur in Badaganadu to Vithapa, a resident of the village by the gauda prabhus of Hebbayal Beliganabadu in Ayyathunadu (fifty nadu). The names of the gaudaprabhus are given. The district of Badaganadu referred to in this inscription is a sub-division (Kampana) of Santalige-Sasira province.[145] Another inscription speaks of the Badaganadikas as a sub-division or community of Brahmans.[146] It follows that the Brahman community known as the Badaganadinavaru are the descendants of the people who once inhabited parts of Shimoga district.

10) There is also epigraphical evidence of the nad-prabhus making grants. During the Viceroyalty of the governor, Virupanna Odeyar in A.D.1377, all the nad-prabhus in the Nasavandu-nad-sime of Maduranka nad gave to Becharasa's son Goyindeva (Govinda Deva) lands in the Attigare village as a free gift.[147] In A.D.1404 the ruling prabhus of the nadus of the Araga Venthe Eighteen Kampana along with others (specified) granted to Kallappa and Mayanna a gift of land in the Kobade village of Rau-nadu (specified).[148]

144. Ibid., Tl.114.
145. MAR, 1931, No.64.
146. EC, XII, Tp.1.
147. EC, VIII, Tl.119.
148. Ibid., Tl.196.

Certain Monarchs as well as ~~their~~ certain Viceroys were held in great esteem by the people. Inscription from Araga Eighteen Kampaṇa testifying to this will be dealt with later in our discussion of the activities of the nāḍu assembly of that place. In this connection, reference may be made to a few other inscriptions which establish the fact.

1) In A.D.1384, Lakkarasa of Sādali, together with the nāḍu prabhus (named) of Koḷala in Nikarili-chōḷa-Maṇḍala made a grant of the lands belonging to Chikka-Hayur in Koḷalanāḍu for the offerings and decorations of the god Mūlasthāna, which is Kailāsa, in order that increase of life, health and wealth, and universal empire might be to the champion over the Kantikara Raya, Nagaṇṇa Oḍeyar's son Dēpaṇṇa Oḍeyar.[149]

2) In the same year and with the same object, but this time referring to Nāgaṇṇa-Oḍeyar himself and to his son, the nāḍmahāprabhus of Koḷala, together with the same adhikāri Lakkarasappa Mukaṇṇa-Jīya, Sōvaṇṇa-Jīya, Yiri Seṭṭi and all the farmers and subjects being agreed, made a grant of all the lands (specified) belongingto the Haḷeya Kottanur village in Koḷala-nāḍu.[150]

3) In A.D.1385, for the success of the sword and

---

149. EC, X, Kl.80.
150. Ibid., 67.

arm of Harihara Raya, Raja-rajar and the inhabitants of Pulliyur-nadu, including Turavar Nambivari Śettiyar, the superintendent of the Pulliyur-nadu made a grant of certain specified lands and several taxes for the god Varadaraja of Pulliyur.[151]

4) Sometimes the Nattavar endowed a whole village to the temple. For instance, in A.D. 1499 the Nattavar of Alattur-Parru endowed the village called Kandaradittamangalam to the temple of the same place for a special worship for the success of svami Narasa Nayaka.[152]

Appreciation of work done for public purposes:

The nadu appreciated work done for public purposes, and also made grants for a similar purpose. The people of Pubbiyurnadu together with Dati Singeya Dannayaka, Nambi Somasetti, Pulimara Gauda, Anaiyar, the accountant of the nadu and (others named), granted to Nambi Devi Setti, the pool situated between Attivallai and Śulivallai adjoining Sattiparam, which after clearning out the silt, he had made into a tank, as a Kudangai.[153] (Attivallai Śulivallai irandukkum nadur-ana palla).

In A.D.1560, the farmers and Senabova of Taluku and the farmers and Senabovas of the fourteen places in the

151. EC, VI, Ht.93.
152. 190 of 1941.
153. EC, IX, Ht.56.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Dodari-Sime, granted for a tank a manya to the mahanayakacharya Yellappa Nayaka.[154]

Grants of Land in the Presence of the People:

Grants of land were often made in the presence of the people. The association of the people with their activities shows how much importance the rulers attached to the localbodies which represented the people of the locality, and encouraged them. It also resulted in knitting closer the ties between the rulers and their subjects. A few examples may be given.

1. A Tamil record mentions that in A.D.1340, Tengal Vallappa Dannayakar and the inhabitants of Kaivara-nadu granted specific land inthe village of Nelavaypalli and shares in Kaivara-nadu to Periya Gomali and Kariya Gomali having set up boundary stones marked with the discus (of Vishnu).[155] In this instance, we see the ruler in association with the people making the grant. The purpose of the gift is not stated.

2. In A.D.1342, all the subjects of Elahanka-nad and the Mahasamantadhipati Chikka Bayiraya Nayaka's son Honnamaraya

---

154. EC, XI, Cl.3.
155. EC, IX, Ht.104.

Nāyaka, granted specified land at Jakkūr to the nāḍ-Senabōva Ālāḷa as a sarvamānya kodage.[156]

3) In A.D.1359, the mahāsāmantādhipati Mayileya Nāyaka's younger brother Yōjaya Nāyaka and Sānteya Nāyaka, with all the subjects and farmers of the great Pa .... nāḍ, made some grant.[157]

4) In A.D.1361, Vallappa-deṇṇāyakkar and the inhabitants of Vēppūr-nāḍu, Śokkayappan and others made a grant.[158]

5) In A.D.1388, Guṇannaya-Nāyaka in the presence of the subjects of the Elahaṅka-nāḍu and Nallūr-nāḍu made a grant having placed it before the nāḍavaru, before all the citizens for consideration (nāḍavara munditṭu; Samasta Prajegavuḍagaḷa munditṭu).[159]

6) In A.D.1556 the mahānāyakācārya Niḍugal Timmanna-Nāyaka in the presence of all the subjects of Niḍugal-sime made a grant.[160] Thus the people of a nadu and the officials of the government could unite for a common purpose.

We have also examples of joint-sale by the citizens of a nāḍu in the Vijayanagara empire. In A.D.1388 the Heggaḍes (named) of Neṇaṅgi-nāḍu gave to Selisatīrtha Śrīpāda of the Muniyūr Maṭha and his disciple Vaikuṇṭha Tīrtha a deed

156. ~~Ibid., En.Ext.~~ EC, IX, Bn.21.
157. Ibid., Nl.23.
158. Ibid., Bn.101.
159. Ibid., Dv.72.
160. EC, XII, Pg.40.

of sale of land in their nadu for 62 honnu.[161] In A.D.1393 the Heggades of the same nadu sold the Arangodigi land to Lakshmi-narayana Deva of the same matha for seventy gadyanas.[162] There are several inscriptions of the nadu people of the Araga Eighteen Kampana and the people of the three cities (not named) writing and agreeing together selling lands which will be referred to later.

Formation of Agraharas by the Nadu:

There are instances of nadu people forming agraharas.

1. In A.D.1384, the nad-mahaprabhus of Kolala, Adhikari Lakkarasappa of Sadali, Mukanna Jiya, Sovanna Jiya, Yirisetti and all the farmers and subjects having come to an agreement, made a grant of all the lands (specified) belonging to the Holeya-Kottanur village in Kolala, and divided the lands into 16 shares and distributed them.[163]

2) In A.D. 1405, the nadu people of the Eighteen Kampana, all those of the three cities and owners of the villages sold lands to Viranna-Odeyar, for the formation of an agrahara called Madhava-Virupakshapura.[164]

---

161. EC, VI, Kp.28.
162. Ibid., 29.
163. EC, X, Kl.67.
164. EC, VIII, Tl.105.

3) Again in A.D.1407, the assembly of the same nāḍu sold land in Mayise village, rated at 60 hon to make an agrahāra.[165]

4) An epigraph of A.D.1413 records the creation of an agrahāra near Ummaṭṭūr and the settlement of Brahmans therein with gifts of land to them made by Perumāḷedēva, chief of Tāyūr-nāḍu and several gauḍas of Tāyūr and others in villages in the neighbourhood (nāḍaprabhu Ummaṭṭūru Gavuḍagaḷa Voppa).[166]

The nāḍu people, in addition to establishing agrahāras, made grants to them. For example in A.D.1342 the inhabitants of Periya-nāḍu of Pulliyūr made a grant to all the mahājanas of Ivaṭṭam alias Varadarāja-Chaturvēdi-maṅgalam.[167] In A.D.1433 we come across a gift of land to Gujjodiya Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa by Surēśvara Śrīpāda and the people at large (dēśa samastaru) for the daily recital of purāṇa in the Mada-Kēśava temple throughout the year and during the thirty days of the month of Sōne in the month of Surēśvara.[168]

Donations to Chhatras and Maṭhas:

The nāḍu assembly provided sometimes chhatras (rest houses). For example, in A.D.1430 (an effaced record),

---

165. EC, VIII, Tl.190.
166. MAR, 1931, No.58.
167. EC, IX, Ht.135.
168. Panchmukhi, R.S.: Karnātak Inscriptions, I, No.53.

Śrīgirinātha Oḍeyar gave munificent donations for a new chhatra of the god Śrīgiri Mallikārjuna. Sangama Dēvi (wife of Śrīgiri Oḍeyar) gave up the house she was in, together with the wells and fruit-trees, for the nineteen Brahmans of the chhatra. And for the ten Jangamas for whom the nāḍu people have provided in the chhatra, 'the Brahman who attends to them, and two Sudra women to clean up, for these thirteen persons, whoever is the manager of the Brahman chhatra will collect from the nāḍu people the amount specified and provide the bhatta (or rice) required for the whole thirty-two persons.' Here it is probable that we find the nāḍu people taxing themselves to maintain the chhatra. Unfortunately the inscription does not throw light on the question whether the nāḍu people themselves authorised the collection of the specified fee.[169] In A.D. 1431 one Rāyaṇṇa Oḍeyar also constructed a chhatra and other works of merit. All the farmers and subjects of Anavēri-nāḍu and the Hoḷeya-Honnūr-nāḍ agreeing among themselves, gave to Rāyaṇṇa Oḍeyar a Śāsana of a gift of land, "for the chhatra and other works of merit we have given Daṇṇāyakapura, free of all taxes, also the nāḍ dues", ... in the presence of all the gods of Kūḍali.[170]

---

169. EC, VIII, Tl.33.
170. EC, VI, Kp.29.

In A.D.1391 the Heggades of the nāḍu sold the Arangodigi land to Lakshminārāyaṇa-dēva of the same maṭha for 70 gadyāṇa (Samastānadavaru koṭṭa).[171] In A.D.1448 Kōṭeyappa-Heggaḍe of Navamanda in Paḍuvagēri-nāḍ gave a grant of land for a Satra for feeding twelve Brahmans in front of the maṭha on the banks of the Tungabhadrā.[172]

Nāḍu Duties or Imposts:

It may not be out of place in this connection to say a few words about the nāḍu duties. There seems to have been the custom of levying what was called nāḍu duties or imposts in a nāḍu. We learn from an inscription of A.D. 1431[173] referred to above that the nāḍu duties were the following:- Tax on artisans, village gadyāṇa, the five kinds of workmen, tax on oil mills, tax on tortoises, stamp on looms, inward and outward dues, food for watchmen, loading of sweepings and gauḍa's claim. The person who constituted the Tōṭṭiyam caste in Pulliyūr-nāḍu in about A.D.1369 had to pay one paṇam for every village.[174] This was a tax on caste. The government also derived revenue from voluntary contributions from the people. We are told in the grant mentioned above that the Tōṭṭigan caste in Pulliyūr-nāḍu came to the conclusion that every one who did not pay shall be an outcaste from the nāḍu, the assembly, the pañchālam,

---

171. EC, VI, Kp.29.
172. Ibid., Kp.32.
173. EC, VII, Sh.71.
174. EC, IX, Ht.103.

the parai and the eighteen nādus. It shows that the communal organizations passed rules governing the members of the community. Inscriptions mention numerous other taxes.

Section 8:

The Assemblies of the Āraga Eighteen Kampanas:

Kampana was an administrative unit in Karnataka. It was a term used for groups of villages or sub-divisions. Referring to this division Fleet says: "Kampana is probably another form of the Canarese 'Kampala, Kampilu', a cluster, heap, assemblage, multitude."[175] The terms used for groups of villages or sub-divisions include bhāga, kampana, nādu, sthala, thānā, valita, vēnthe, vishaya, vitti and vritti.[176]

The Kampanas had representative institutions like Nādus. The nādu assembly functioned admirably and inscriptions illustrate clearly its many sided activities. The nādu assembly as we have pointed out could be summoned by an officer of the government and it also met of its own accord. This is confirmed by the Āraga inscriptions. In A.D.1363, the great minister Nāganna and various important officials like Pradhāna Dēvarasa, along with other arasus or lords and the Jaina Mallappa summoned the elders of the three cities

---

175. IA, IV, p.211 f.n.
176. Dikshit, opcit., p.22.

and the Eighteen Kampane and held an enquiry. The inscription refers to the venue of the meeting. It met in the Arage chāvadi or hall.[177] As an example of the nādu meeting of its own accord we have numerous inscriptions. ~~For example,~~ In A.D.1407 all the nādu people and those of the three cities came to a certain agreement. It is obvious that it met of its own accord.[178]

We have seen that an important function of the nādu assembly was to make land grants and endowments to temples. This is well established by the Āraga inscriptions.

1) An inscription at Banavāsi in Sirsi Taluk, dated A.D. 1368 registers a gift of land by the gaudas and the subjects (praje) of eighteen Kampanas of Gutti. When Mādhavānka was governing Banavāsi-12000, the latter's servant Ahōbalanātha effected repairs to the temple of Gōpinātha. At his request, the gaudas and the subjects (praje) of eighteen Kampanas of Gutti, assembled at Banavāsi and made a gift of land for the benefit of the temple.[179]

It is possible to draw the following inferences from this inscription: Firstly the existence of a representative assembly; Secondly, the inscription throws light on the conduct of the assembly. It records that the members of the assembly were seated (kūtavāgi kullidu), and finally

177. EC, VIII, Tl.197.
178. Ibid., 162.
179. SII, XX, No.230.

it made gifts of land to temples.

2) In A.D.1377, all the Brahmans of the two Kannūr agrahāras in Harahalli-nāḍ and of Edihalli and Gavalūr, and the seventy villages, and all the gauḍas and chiefs of the nāḍu (nāḍa samasta gauḍa prabhugaḷu) made a grant of rice land belonging to the Gautama village for the god Narasimha. This was when the minister Mādarasa-Oḍeyar was ruling over Āraga, Gutti and the other kingdoms of the hill country (male-dēśa).[180]

3) In A.D.1404 all the nāḍus of the Eighteen Kampaṇa of the Āraga-vēnṭhe, and all the cultivators of the three cities, having agreed together, (Hadinentu Kampaṇada Samastanāḍu mūru paṭṭaṇada samasta halaru) made for the offerings of the god Kalinātha of the Mūlasthāna of Āraga a grant of land rated at 12 hon in the Boraḍi village, with freedom from Suṅka, Karuka, grāma gadyāṇa, pañcha karuka and all other dues.[181] In this instance, the assembly also made exemptions of taxes. These grants were made by unanimous consent.

4) Again in A.D.1405, all the farmers of the Mandu-nāḍu Four of Muduvaṅka nāḍu in the Eighteen Kampaṇas of Āraga

180. EC, VII, Sk.35.

181. EC, VIII, Tl.9.

and of the nādu thirty, agreeing among themselves granted to the god Kalinātha of the Mūlasthāna of Āraga a gift of land.[182]

The nādu assembly ~~also~~ made gifts of land for charitable purposes and it also sold lands. In A.D.1396, all the Brahmans, farmers and subjects ...... in the Āraga kingdom, and all the nādu people of Muduvankanādu, agreeing among themselves granted to one Virupanna a gift of land.[183] In A.D.1404 all the nādu people of the Āraga Eighteen Kampanas, and all the people of the three cities, (Samasta-nāda, mūru pattanada halaru), uniting and agreeing together sold to a certain Viththappa, the Kaudvalli village for 95 hon.[184] Again, in A.D.1407, all the people of the Mandunādu thirty of Hombucha-nādu in the Āraga Eighteen Kampana gave to a certain Kamōja a gift of land in Halevanahalli as a kodagi.[185] Further, in A.D.1415, those of the nādus and three cities of the Āraga Eighteen Kampana, agreeing together made to one Vithalanna a sale of land.[186] Thus the nādu assembly could sell lands within its jurisdiction. In A.D.1427 the Heggades (named) of Santaligenādu in the Āraga-Venthe and all the people of the nādu

---

182. EC, VIII, Tl.12.
183. EC, VIII, Tl.8.
184. Ibid., 133.
185. Ibid., 122.
186. Ibid., 217.

(samasta nādavaru) gave to Hariyakanāyakitti of Hebbaradi, a deed of sale for 30 Salage of land in Arāmavalli for 85 varaha. The purchaser presented the land to Amarēśvara-tīrtha-Śrīpada, for a chhatra in connection with his matha.[187]

The nādu assembly not only established agrahāras but also encouraged their formation. In A.D. 1403 the cultivators of the three cities of the Eighteen Kampana-nādu of the Āraga kingdom, having agreed together, gave to Viththalappa-Vodeyar a deed of sale of land valued at 150 honnu. It was formed into an agrahāra named Bommanapura, divided into 54 shares out of which four were given for the temple, and 50 shares for the Brahmans.[188] In A.D. 1405, the nādu people of the Eighteen Kampana and all those of the three cities and owners of villages made a sale of land to Viranna Odeyar for the formation of an agrahāra called Mādhava-Virūpākshapura.[189] Again, in A.D.1405, all the gaudas and subjects of the two Mandu-nādu of Hombuchchanādu in Āraga-Vēnthe Kampana, agreeing among themselves gave to Mallibhatta a Śāsana of a sale of land. He made it an agrahāra named Narasimhabhāratīpura.[190] In A.D.1407, one Timanna-ayya, with the consent of all the

187. EC, VI, Kp.27.
188. EC, VI, Kp.53.
189. EC, VIII, Tl.105.
190. Ibid., 126.

nādu people sold to Bommanna-ayya, land in Mayise village, rated at 60 hon to establish an agrahāra.[191] Again in A.D.1407, all the nādu people gave land yielding 100 hon to Vairāgya Śivāchārya deva guru, who formed it into an agrahāra named Dakshināmūrthi-Śivāchāryapura.[192] In A.D. 1408, all the farmers and subjects of the Āraga Eighteen Kampana and all those of the three cities, agreeing among themselves made a grant in the Surali village and made it an agrahāra named Nāgasamudra.[193]

From the foregoing evidence concerning the nādu, we can postulate a general observation that the Vijayanagara rulers allowed the local institutions to continue. We can see the spirit of cooperation at work in the nādus, and their corporate spirit was admirable. The activities of the nādu are decisive proof of the existence of local institutions which continued to flourish and function under the Vijayanagara empire, and those local bodies functioned with the cooperation and corporate spirit of those committed to their care. In the organisation and administration of the towns and guilds also we find the autonomous character of the local bodies, to which we can turn in the next chapter.

---

191. Ibid., 190.
192. Ibid., 168.
193. Ibid., 222.

CHAPTER V

TOWNS AND GUILDS

Section 1:

Introductory:

The distinction between village and town was observed in the terminology used to denote the local area. The general term used to denote a village was grāma. Pura, nagara and pattana denoted a town. A town contained a large population (Bahujana Saṁkīrṇasya).[1] The Mitākṣara also distinguishes between grāma, kharvaṭa and nagara[2] - a village, a small town and a city. Paes, the Portuguese traveller who visited Vijayanagara, distinguishes between villages, towns and cities. He observes, "the whole country is thickly populated with cities, towns and villages."[3]

In addition to the terminology used to denote the local units, the contrast between a city and a village could also be seen in size, in the standard of comfort, in the trade and general economic organization of the urban area.[4] We can take them in turn to understand the economic characteristics of a mediaeval town.

---

1. Mādhavācharya, Parāśara-Mādhava (Ed. Chandrakanta Tarkalankara, Vols.1-3, Calcutta, 1890-2), III, p.266.
2. Vijñāneśvara, The Mitākṣara (J.R. Gharpure, Bombay, 1910) ii, V.167.
3. Sewell, op.cit., p.230.
4. Appadorai, A. Economic Conditions in Southern India (1000-1500 A.D.) (Madras, 1936, Vols. 1-2) I, p.345.

According to the Mitāksara the town was twice a village and a city four times larger. It says "A space of one hundred Dhanus in extent should be left between a village and the fields; of two hundred for a small town; and of four hundred for a city".[5] Nicolo Conti, the Italian traveller who visited Vijayanagara about the year A.D.1420 or 1421 begins his description of Vijayanagara thus: "The great city of Bizenegalia (that is how he calls Vijayanagara) is situated near very steep mountains. The circumference of the city is sixty miles; its walls are carried up to the mountains and enclose the valleys at their foot, so that its extent is thereby increased."[6] Abdur Razaak, who was entrusted with an embassy from Persia visited Vijayanagara in A.D.1443 and observes, "The city of Bidjanagar is such that the pupil of the eye has never seen a place like it ......"[7] Further, he says, "In the space from the third to the seventh fortress one meets a numberless crowd of people, ... The bazaars are extremely long and broad."[8]

The conveniences of life were better in towns than in villages. The roads were broader in towns. Nuniz,

---

5. Vijñānēśvara, The Mitāksara, ii, V.167.
6. Sewell, op.cit., p.80.
7. Ibid., p.86.
8. Ibid., p.88.

another Portuguese traveller who visited Vijayanagara writing about Hospet observes thus: "King Crisnarao made in it a street very long and large with houses of masonry .... The town has one principal street, of length four thousand and seven hundred paces, and breadth forty, which is certainly the most beautiful street it is possible to see."[9] Paes has this to say about one of the streets in the city of Vijayanagara, "You have a broad and beautiful street, full of rows of fine houses and streets ...."[10] The city of Vijayanagara had a plentiful supply of water. Hampi had its supply of water from the Turuttu channel and the Tungabhadrā.[11] Further, a large trade existed in a town. It was mainly a commercial corporation or a merchant guild. Further information is given in the chapter on guilds. The Nagara looks like an administrative unit devoted to a special field, namely, commerce and industry.

Section 2:

Formation of Towns:

Vijayanagara:

The formation and the growth of towns in the Vijayanagara empire was helped by a number of factors. A town sometimes grew around a temple. A famous temple would

9. Ibid., p.345.
10. Ibid., p.246.
11. Longhurst, A.H., Hampi Ruins described and illustrated (Madras, 1917), p.51.

attract people, and become a place of pilgrimage. Thus a religious centre or place of pilgrimage developed into a town. Srī Virūpāksha was the tutelary deity of the city of Hampi, the modern site of the city of Vijayanagara.[12] The city was on the banks of the Tungabhadrā and was in the form of a circle.[13] According to Abdur Razaak, the city was so built that it had seven fortified hills one within the other. There were six fortresses one within the other, and the palace of the king was within the last one.[14] Paes also says that the city was fortified by strong walls "made of very strong masonry such as would be found in few other parts. Further, he observes, "..... the city of Bisnaga (the Portuguese rendering of Vijayanagara) ...... is the capital of all the kingdom of Narsymga, where the king always resides, you have many cities and walled villages ....", and futher, "..... and the city is situated in the middle of these hills and is entirely surrounded by them."[15] Again, he observes, "..... on the north three very beautiful pagodas, one of which is called Vitella (Viṭṭhalasvāmi), and it stands over against this city of Nargumdym; the other is called Aoperadianer, (Virūpāksha temple in Hampi) and this is the one which they

---

12. EI, III, p.22, V. 42-1356 A.D.
13. Elliot, History of India, IV. p.106.
14. Sewell, op.cit., pp.86-90.
15. Ibid., pp.235-236.

hold in most veneration and to which they make great pilgrimages."[16] Though parts of the temple date their existence to the pre-Vijayanagara period, yet additions were made to it by the Vijayanagara kings. Krishnadeva Raya built the rangamantapa in front of the main shrine in honour of his coronation. The temple of Virupaksha was the place where the coronation ceremony of Vijayanagara kings took place. An inscription records thus: ".....the illustrious Vira Krishnaraya Maharaya, at the auspicious time of the festival of his coronation, for (providing) daily oblations of food, to the holy Virupaksha-deva "granted to the temple the village of Singanayakanahalli.[17] The Vijayanagara rulors, till the rise of the Aravidu family, always subscribed themselves at the end of their grants, in the name of their tutelary deity of Hampe, Virupaksha, in the Kannada script.[18] An inscription from Hassan dated A.D. 1406 records, "his (Bukka-raja) capital was the nagari named Vijaya, situated in the Hemakuta, with the Tungabhadra as its protector, the 'King of Kings', Harihara as its ruler.. ...."[19]

In this connection, adescriptionof the city of Vijayanagara and itssuburbs will enable us to understand

---

16. Ibid., pp.250-251.
17. EI, I. pp.363 & 370; 29 of 1889.
18. EI, XIV, pp.240, 322.
19. EC, V, Hn.133.

how it grew, and we also get an insight into the administration of the different suburbs.[20]

The city of Vijayanagara, from its foundation according to tradition in A.D.1336, until it was destroyed in A.D.1565, was one of the greatest cities of the times. It extended from Ānegundi in the north to Hospet in the South, and from Hampi in the West to Kamalāpuram in the East, It had its suburbs within this area, each a self contained unit consisting of its principal temple with a bazaar in front. There was Hampi or Pampānagarī in the region near the Virūpāksha temple, and the bazaar in its front. We have Achyutapuram built by Achyutarāya with the Achyutarāya temple. The bazaar near the temple is called in an inscription as Achyutarāyapēṭa.[21] Its boundaries are described thus: West-Mātaṅgaparvata or hill, east-Tiparāja garden, north-Seetākuṇḍa (a part of the Tuṅgabhadrā), and south-Bhūpati tank. Tirumalapuram named after Kṛishṇadēva Rāya's son Tirumala was another suburb with its magnificent Viṭhala shrine.[22]

Paes observes, "on the north-west side (of Bisnaga) is another city called Crisnapor (Kṛishṇapura) connected with Bisnaga, in which are all their Pagodas, those in which they

20. Dikshit, G.S.: Social and Economic Life, Chapter XII, in Karnātaka Through the Ages (Pub.Govt. of Mysore,1968)

21. SII, IX, (ii), No.564.

22. Rangacharya, V.: Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency, I, Bellary, No.327.

most worship, and all the revenue of this city is granted to them, and they say they have a revenue of a hundred thousand pardaos of gold."[23] Paes here refers to Krishnapura, another suburb of Vijayanagara.

(Krishnapura was another suburb of Vijayanagara. An inscription of A.D.1533 refers to the grain shops in the bazaar (Krishnapuradanēte).[24] Another inscription of A.D.1545 also refers to the Krishnapuranēte.[25] The centre of the suburb was the Krishna temple and the source of water for this part was the channel called in the latter record as Yiriya (or big) channel. The modern town of Hospet contains two suburbs both built by Krishnadēva Rāya, one in honour of his wife and called Tirumaladēviyara pattana,[26] and the other in honour of his mother and called Nāgalāpura. Paes observes, "on the south-side is the other city called Nagalapor in a plain; in it the Yadalcao stopped with all his forces when he besieged Bisnaga, and he razed it to the ground; but already it is again rebuilt and this is a league from Bisnaga."[27] Nuniz, another Portuguese traveller to the city observes, "This king built a city ... and called its name Nagallapur, and surrounded it with a new wall which is one of the best works that he has in his kingdom, and he

---

23. Sewell, op.cit., p.278.
24. SII, IV, No.262.
25. Ibid., No.265.
26. Ibid., No.263.
27. Sewell, op.cit., p.278.

made in it a street very long and large with houses all of masonry. In order to people this town he ordered all the chiefs of his kingdom to build themselves palaces therein, and so they did. This town has one principal street, of length four thousand and seven hundred paces, and breadth forty, which is certainly the most beautiful street it is possible to see; and he made and finished this town without stinting any expense on it."[28] In Kamalāpuram, there was a suburb known as Varadarājammana-paṭṭaṇa, probably constructed by Achyutarāya in honour of his wife Varadādēvi.[29]

There was a locality called Añjanagiri with the temple of Tiruvengalanātha. Its boundaries were: east-Hiriya Kumbhārakēri or Big Potter's street, north-Akkipēte, or Rice Bazaar, west-Mina-Vanaguḍi, and south- the fort.[30] There was also another suburb Rāmapuram,[31] probably near the Hazāra Rāma temple. The entrance to the city from the east was from Kampili, which was a kind of an outpost to the capital.[32] A part of it was known as Vijaya Virūpapura.[33]

Inscriptional evidence shows that the administration of the different suburbs was in the hands of Mayors called

28. Ibid., p.345.
29. SII, IX (ii), No.595, Ibid., No.573.
30. SII, IX (ii), No.510.
31. Rangacharya, Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency, I, Bellary, No.369.
32. Dikshit, Soc. and Eco. Life, Karnātaka Through the Ages, p.602.
33. SII, IX (ii), No.530.

Settipattanasvāmis. A record of A.D.1535 at Hospet refers to the Settipattanasvāmis (to be dealt with later in this chapter) of Tirumaladēviyarapattana, Varadarājammanapattana, and Krishnapura.[34]

Other towns:

Śrīgirisamudra:

According to an inscription from Magadi, in A.D.1370 Śrīgiri-dēva-odeyar, having given a command, one Vīrappa built the town of Śrīgirisamudra in honour of the god Śivagańga.[35] In this case, an officer of the king was responsible for founding a town at a religious centre.

Bommanahalli:

An inscription from Gundlupet dated A.D.1494, records that Dēvarāya built a new town in Bommanahalli, which was assigned free of rent for the offerings of the god Triyambaka. The boundaries of the new town were marked with stones bearing the sign of the Linga. A tank was also constructed, areca trees were planted under it, and the town was rented out for 12 gadyāna.[36] Thus old towns gave place to new towns.

Sometimes an inducement was given to those who took the lead. A record[37] from Tigadahalli (Mandya district)

34. Ibid., No.573.
35. EC, IX, Ma.49.
36. EC, IV, Gu.2.
37. MAR, 1920, p.35.

registers the grant of "a village as a pura (town) by Mallappa son of Nāga-paṇḍita, the Sthānapati (trustee) of the Pañchamaṭha of Taḷakāḍu, to Mārabhakta and several others (named), the shares of each being specified. The grantees were to pay a small sum of money upto A.D.1339, a slightly increased sum up to A.D.1342 and thenceforward a consolidated sum."

Tirumalapuri:

Sometimes a town was founded by a single individual with the help of the people of the village. An inscription from Pavagada,[38] of about A.D.1366, records that Rājudēva-gavuḍa and others, with the assistance of 700 workers, founded the three towns, Tirumalapuri, Ambhōjapaṭṇa and Rājugiripaṭṇa. The amount spent on founding the three towns was 870 Lakshmīpati Varaha, 2000 Sabbaraliga Varaha and 150 Puṭali Kāsu. Rājudēvagavuḍu rewarded the headmen of the workers who built the town with niluva-dōpu (what they could carry standing), gold bracelets and five double shawls. Thus this record not only gives the actual amount spent on the construction of the three towns, but also shows that an inducement was given to those who supervised the construction.

38. EC, XII, Pg.18.

Krishnapura:

An inscription from Holalkere[39] of A.D.1554 shows that rights were given to the first settlers in a new town, obviously to aid the building of new towns and accelerate their development. In this instance, the outer pēte (bazaar) being in ruins, Narasimmaiya of the customs department made petition to Viṭhaṇṇa-Nāyaka, whereupon he sent for Liṅgaṇagauḍa and many others (named), and all the subjects, and directed them to have the pēte rebuilt giving it the other name of Kṛishṇapura after Era-Kṛishṇappa-Nāyakayya and populate it. Those who settled there would bebe free from payment of all taxes for one year from the time of their settlement.

Vicinity to a River, a factor which helped the growth of towns:

Towns were generally centres of internal trade, and rivers were useful for transporting goods from the interior to the ports. Ānegundi was situated on a river, ~~which gave its name to it~~. According to Paes, "A captain lives in this city (Ānegundi) for the king. People cross to this place by boats which are round like baskets, inside they are made of cane, and outside are covered with leather; they are

39. EC, XI, Hk.112.

able to carry fifteen or twenty persons, and even horses and oxen can cross in them if necessary; but for the most part these animals swim across. Men row them with a sort of paddle ...."[40] Commerce was thus the cause of the growth of some towns.

<u>Anantapur and Piriyarājapaṭṭana</u>:

Sometimes the names and titles of kings and ministers were given to towns. For example, Anantapur is derived from Anantarasa, the minister of the founders of the Vijayanagara empire.[41] An inscription from Chamarajanagar of about A.D.1486 records that the <u>mahāmaṇḍalēśvara</u> Vīra-Pārvati-Rāya-Voḍeyar granted a settlement to a person (name not clear), who built a town in the name of Pārvati-Rāya-Voḍeyar in Chandavādi.[42] A Hunsur record of A.D.1589 states that the <u>mahāmaṇḍalēśvara</u> Kulōttuṅga-Chaṅgāḷva Piriya-Rājaiya-Dēva caused a town to be built, and gave the name Piriyarājapaṭṭana, after himself.[43]

<u>Fairs</u>:

The establishment of fairs contributed to the growth of towns. A fair is the coming together of many sellers and buyers in a definite place and at a definite time. It was

---

40. ~~Ibid., p.250.~~ Sewell, <u>op.cit.</u>, p.250.
41. <u>ARSIE</u>, 1925-1926, part ii, para 37. 350 of 1926.
42. <u>EC</u>, IV, Ch.105.
43. <u>EC</u>, IV, Hs.15.

thus an important business centre. The towns where fairs were held provided the merchants and other visitors with certain conveniences such as good roads and plenty of water. The local merchants and their president who was also the town mayor managed these fairs. Expenses concerning the fair were met by duties which were imposed in cash or kind on goods on arrival or in some cases on goods sold and bought. The merchants paid these tolls. Farmers and merchants jointly gave lands and certain dues as rewards to the president for such work and also as a provision for further expenses. Occasionally a piece of land was given to the head of the guild so that he might establish a fair. The market place is called pēṭe, santhe or santhepēṭe. Fairs were also started or revived by the chief (gāuṇḍa) of the nāḍu, and also by orders of the mahāmaṇḍalēśvaras or a minister himself revived an old market.

The following inscriptions illustrate how fairs (santhe) were established:

1) In A.D.1362, all the farmers and subjects of Kayivāra-nāḍu, all the Nānā-dēśis in Pekkuṇḍra and the 18 castes established a fair (santhe) at Kayivāra and appointed Periya-Nāyana, as paṭṭaṇasvāmi.[44] In this instance a big assembly established it.

---

44. EC, X, Ct.95.

2) In A.D.1378, a fair was established in the Rāmeśvara village in Sādali-nāḍ by the Sādalināḍ Gaudas (named), the five Seṭṭis of Sēre, and all the elders of the Sālumūle made certain regulations. Grain entering the fair wholesale, was to be free of all dues for one year.[45] In this case the nāḍu people established a fair and gave exemptions from taxes for one year to encourage the formation of the town.

3) In A.D.1418, at the instance of Chikkamuddeyanāyaka, the chief of the Hemmāḍināḍu, Ballegavuṇḍa started a fair.[46]

4) In A.D.1561, Govrarur-hebbāruva, the chiefs of Maḍahalli-sīme and other Gauḍas granted a Peṭeya-Śāsana conferring the right to collect taxes on shops in the street on the condition of the grantee paying a certain fixed sum for the service of the temple of Chennigarāya. They granted the village Mutenahaḷḷi renamed Chennigarāyapēte as a pēṭe free from all taxes to Chennapa-seṭṭi oncondition that he should pay an annual quit-rent of 30 Varahas for the food offering to god Chennigarāya. In this instance the nāḍu people established a pēte and gave tax exemptions to one of the merchants on certain conditions.[47]

5) We have in inscriptions instances of individuals establishing a fair. In A.D.1528, Mallapaṇṇa of Elabarige caused

45. Ibid., Sd.112.
46. MAR, 1925, No.99.
47. MAR, 1926, No.24.

the construction of a shop or stall, and made a gift of the same, together with the toll-revenue of the fair held at Malapura, and some land at Moraba to the god Sūryanārāyaṇadeva.[48]

6) An inscription from Sidlaghatta records that in A.D.1531 Garbhasaru-mahāpātre granted to one Timmapa the Basava-paṭṭaṇa village as an Umbali-mānya for the Sante (or weekly fair).[49] This is also an example of how a village could be converted into a town by instituting a fair.

7) Sometimes a Nāyaka established a fair. An inscription from Ānekal records that in A.D.1412, Juñjōji-Nāyaka's son Hiriya-Mudiya-Nāyaka established a fair in Sōmegoṇḍanahaḷḷi belonging to his office of Nāyaka.[50] Again in A.D.1418, Juñjubaya-Nāyaka's son Jaka-Mudde-Nāyaka established a fair by the hands of Balla-gāuṇḍa of Himmare-nāḍ, belonging to his office of Nāyaka. All the gauḍas, seṭṭis and others of the nāḍu granted the paṭṭanasvāmitana, together with land (specified) and freedom from all tolls.[51] In this case, after the establishment of the fair by the Nāyaka, the nāḍu acted in granting the lordship with tax exemptions. In A.D. 1531, Kāḷahasti-Nāyaka granted the cumstoms dues and tolls of the fair of Chikka-Malūr.[52]

---

48. SII, IX (ii), No.523.
49. EC, X, Sd.22.
50. EC, IX, An.44.
51. Ibid., 4.
52. EC, XII, Mi.69.

8) A Belur inscription of A.D.1382 gives a list of twentyseven towns which had ~~of established~~ fairs, namely, Vijayanagari, Hastināvati, Dōra Samudra, Gutti, Penukunda, Ādavāni, Udayagiri, Chandragiri, Mulavāyi, Kāñchī, Padevīḍu, Chaduraṅgapaṭṭaṇa, Maṅgalūru, Bārakūru, Honnāvura, Chandravura, Āraga, Chandragutti, Annigere, Huligere, Niḍugallu, Chimatanakallu, Tariyakallu, Adevidda-sari, Kalheya and Telakalāmbi and Siṅgapaṭṭaṇa.[53]

9) Guilds established fairs. An inscription of A.D.1430 from Nonamaṅgla village in Bowringpet (Bangarupete) records that the Sālumūle of the 56 countries, with all the cultivators and the Pañchālas established a fair or sante, and in connection with it, as a mānya for the paṭṭanasvāmi of the fair, Chiyi Bassi seṭṭi, granted land (specified).[54]

When the leaders of the guilds petitioned to the government, it undertook the construction of new towns. They acted on behalf of the community. Various terms such as the leader of the Ubhayanānādēśi,[55] the paṭṭanasvāmi,[56] mahāvaḍḍavyavahāri,[57] the Vaḍḍa-byavahāri[58] were used to denote them and they were sometimes also heads of the town. The great Vaḍḍa-byavahāri, chief of (both sects) Nānādēśis,

---

53. EC, V, Bl.75.
54. EC, X, Bp.72.
55. MAR, 1919, p.33, para 85, A.D.1355.
56. EC, IX, Cn.37 - A.D.1395.
57. EC, X, Kl.73, A.D14o4.
58. EC, IX, An.64, A.D.1427.

Arjju-bhaṭṭayya's son Mahādēvaṇṇa, made petition to Bukkaṇṇa-oḍeyar, saying, 'Make Lakshmīpura [illegible]. in Changa-nāḍ," and the king forthwith passed the necessary orders which were duly executed by the chief minister Sōrappa with the aid of the farmers of Navile, Handarange, Posanāḍ, Allāḷapaṭṭaṇa and other places.[59]

Section 3:

Some Important Urban Centres:

There were undoubtedly a number of urban centres in the Vijayanagara empire. Some of the important towns in the West coast were Ankola, Mergen (Mirjan), Honor (Honāvar), Bhaticala (Bhaṭkaḷ), Majandur (Baindūr), Bacanor (Bārakūr), Barcelore (Basrūr), Mangalore and Cumbola (Kumbḷa).[60] Other important towns were Uddhare (the capital of the Eighteen Kampaṇas),[61] Sangītapura,[62] Bhārangi,[63] Gerasoppe and Bidanur (Bednur).[64]

Mahalingam gives a list of some of the important cities in the central part of the empire, namely, Śrīranga-paṭṭaṇa, Dvārasamudra, Ikkēri, Bankāpura, Raichur, Ādavāni, Vijayanagar and Penukoṇḍa. In the east and south were

---

59. EC, V, Ak.68.
60. Mahalingam, Economic Life in the Vijayanagara Empire (Madras, 1951), p.5.
61. EC, VIII, Sb.152.
62. Ibid., Sa.163.
63. Ibid., Sb.329.
64. Elliot, History of India, IV, p.104.

such cities as Kondavīdu, Śrīśailam, Udayagiri, Kālahasti, Tirupati, Candragiri, Pulicat, Mailāpūr, Kāñcīpuram, Tiruvannāmalai, Chidambaram, Kumbakōnam, Nāgapattinam, Tañjāvūr, Śrīrangam, Madhurai, Śrīvilliputtūr, Tirunelvēli, Rāmēśvaram and Anantaśayanam.[65]

Section 4:

Guild Assemblies: The Craft Guild:

Guild assemblies were also the assemblies of the town. As Appadorai points out it was around the guild that the economic organization of the mediaeval town centered.[66] It was a free and voluntary association of individuals earning their livelihood by the same means or the same kind of labour. They were of two kinds, namely, the caste guild and the merchant guild. The hall-marks of a guild were sameness of occupation and free choice of membership. In acutal practice a great majority of the members of a guild belonged to the same caste or sub-caste. The administration of many townships was largely the concern of a guild.[67] There were a good number of craft guilds functioning in South India. An epigraph records that there were eighteen paṇas (sectaraian divisions) namely the Vyāvahārikas, Pañcālas, (five sects of smiths), Kumbhālikas (potters), Tantuvāyins (weavers), Vastrabhēdikas (cloth dyers), Tilaghātakas (oil millers), Kurāntakas (shoemakers), Vastrarakṣakas

---

65, Mahalingam, Ec. Life, p.5.

66. A. Appadorai, op.cit., I, p.357.

67. Mahalingam, SIP, p.380.

(tailors), devāngas, Parikeliti (keeper of pack bulls), gō-rakṣakas (cowherds), Kirātas (hunters), rajakas (washermen) and Kṣaurakas (barbers).[68] But the Pañcālas, also called the Vīra pañcālas were the best organised.[69]

It was usually a community of interest that led to the formation of a guild. Its members protected the interests of their calling. These organizations appear to have wielded politicalpower also. They enjoyed a number of privileges and cooperated in political matters. They acquired privileges from the kings from time to time. They were organised locally. But there were in existence extra-territorial organizations also. They acted as a body to secure rights and privileges and for making gifts.

The Merchant Guild:

In additionto the craft guild, there was the merchant guild. It was essentially an association of merchants, Abdur Razaak says that the tradesmen of each separate guild or craft had their shops close to one another and that the jewellers sold their rubies, pearls and diamonds openly in the bazaars.[70] Paes gives expression ato the same practice.[71] Members of a trade grouped themselves to form a guild, and played a large part in the commercial life of the country, and accord-

---

68. ARSIE, 1918, paras 84 and 85; EI, XX, p.90.
69. EI, III, pp.67, 69.
70. Elliot, op.cit., IV, p.107.
71. Sewell, op.cit., pp.246-247.

ing to Mahalingam, "very much resembled the Sabhā on account of the large part it played in the administration of the local area."[72] Their bonds of unity, as in the case of the craft guild, were sameness of occupation, adherence to a common code of professional ethics, sharing the rights and privileges conferred on the guild by the state, enjoying the protection afforded by the guild for the life and property of its members, devotion to gods and goddesses in the name of the guild, and ties of neighbourhood.

They derived their income from a variety of sources such as, contribution from the members, profits from banking operations, participation in the tax-farming system, income from corporate property etc.

These bodies were representative in character, and guarded the interests of the local people. Even the paramount power of the high officials of the state never interfered with the rights of these assemblies. The Mitākshara says, "This is the rule for the association of Śrēnis, Naigamas, Pakhandis and ganas. The king should preserve their peculiarities and conserve their rules of old."[73] They could not remit taxes, or make gifts of them, without the consent of these bodies. As Appadorai points out, "the guilds were

---

72. Mahalingam, SIP, p.386.

73. Vignānēśvara, op.cit., V.192. Śrēnis or bodies of artisans are those who subsist by the manufacture of the same commodity.

powerful forces in deciding matters of common importance and as mutual aid societies."[74]

In the Vijayanagara times also, as before, the guilds enjoyed a number of privileges and cooperated in political matters. Mahalingam rightly points out, "there was no field of activity, political, economic and social, in which the guilds did not make their influence felt."[75]

The merchant guilds during this period were many as may be seen from the different terms used to denote them namely the banajigas, nānādési, ubhaya-nānādési, nagara, nakhara, Vaiśyas, Settis, Settiguttas, bīra-Vanijas, ayyāvole, manigrāmam, Elame, Hañjamāna etc., to which reference will be made later in this chapter.

Section 3: The guilds were self-governing local bodies. A full account of these guilds is found in the inscriptions of South Kanara which will be dealt with later in this chapter.

Section 5:

Their Leaders: These associations had leaders. We do not know how they were chosen. The leaders of the mercantile guilds were sometimes also heads of the town.[76] They were known by different names, namely, the leader of the Ubhaya-nānādési,[77] the pattanasvāmi,[78] mahāvaddavyavahāri,[79] vadda-byavahāri,[80]

---

74. Appadorai, op.cit., I, p.377.
75. Mahalingam, Economic Life, p.34.
76. MAR, 1925, No.36.
77. Ibid., 1919, p.33, para 85.
78. EC, IX, An.44, EC, IX, An.64, EC, IX, Ht.128, EC. X, Bg.72, EC, X, Bg.83; EC, X, Mr.4; SII, IX (ii), No.516, 618.
79. EC, X, Kl.73.
80. EC, V, Ag.68, EC, IX, Bn.56, EC, IX, Cp.37; MAR, 1928, No.88.

patta-viyāpāri,[81] setti,[82] svāmi or the lordship of the settis,[83] Prithuvi-setti,[84] settipattanasvāmi,[85] Settitana,[86] purapati,[87] nagarēśvara and pattanadhīśvara,[88] and mahāprabhu.[89] They had also some connection with the management of the municipal affairs of the town. The constitution and working of a guild must have differed from place to place and from time to time. The leader must have exercised some control over the working of the organization and acted as its accredited representative in its dealings with the central government. The pattanasvāmi or setti was probably the head of all the mercantile corporations in a given place.

Section 6:

The Pattanasvāmi:

Mode of Appointment:

The Pattanasvāmi was sometimes the founder of the town. In A.D.1430, Chiyi-Bassi-setti, the pattanasvāmi of the fair in Maragal was granted land.[90] In A.D.1531, one Timmappa was granted the Basavapattana village as a mānya

81. EC, IX, Bn.59.
82. EC, IX, Bn.96; EC, XI, Hk.17; EC, IV, Yl.2; EC, X, Sd.122.
83. EC, IX, An.4.
84. EC, VIII, Sb.18.
85. EC, X, Bl.6.
86. EC, VIII, Sb.428; MAR, 1926, No.119.
87. MAR, 1928, No.37.
88. EC, IX, Bn.96.
89. EC, X, Kl.73.
90. EC, X, Bg.72.

for the Sante (or weekly fair).[91] The office of Pattana-svāmi, during the Vijayanagara times was acquired in two ways. It could be conferred by the people of the locality or their representatives. Popular consent was taken to make the appointment. Here we can see representative element at work. We can draw this inference from the evidence of the following inscriptions:-

1) In A.D.1362, all the farmers and subjects of Kayivāra-nāḍu all the Nānā-deśis in Pekkundra (~~to be considered later in this chapter~~) and of the eighteen castes, appointed as paṭṭanasvāmi of the fair Periya-Nāyaka.[92]

2) An inscription from Sorab Taluk of Shimoga District of A.D.1383, records that all the Sālumūle of Gutti Eighteen Kampaṇa, Vakhaligere-nāḍu, Honnaṭṭi-nāḍu, Halasige, Honnale, Ingundi and other places having agreed among themselves gave to Mude-daṇṇāyaka the office of Seṭṭi.[93]

3) An inscription from Anekal Taluk in Bangalore District of A.D.1412, records that the Hirasu-nāḍ prabhu and a number of others including the representatives of the fiftysix countries granted the office of paṭṭanasvāmi to Mari-seṭṭi's sons, Daṇḍi-seṭṭi and Tirumalaseṭṭi.[94]

---

91. EC, X, Sd.22.
92. EC, X, Ct.95.
93. EC, VIII, Sb.428.
94. EC, IX, An.44; Fifty-six means many.

4) Another inscription from the same place of A.D.1418 records that all the _gaudas_, _settis_ and others of Himmare-nāḍu granted the lordship of the _settis_ (_svāmitana_) to Balla-gāuṇḍa.[95]

5) Yet another inscription from the same place dated A.D.1427, records that the office of _Pattaṇesvāmi_ was granted by the great senior merchants and the representatives of both sects of _Nānā-dēśis._[96]

6) A record of A.D.1430 from Nonamangla village in Bowringpet Taluk in Kolar District refers to the _Sālumūle_ of the fiftysix countries, with all the cultivators and _pañchālas_ making _Chiyi_ Bassi seṭṭi, _Pattanasvāmi_ (place not specified).[97]

Sometimes the office was conferred by a government servant on a prominent merchant. An inscription in Kāmasamudra village in Bowringpet Taluk dated A.D.1426, records that Chitiviyya-Nāyaka gave the office of _Pattanasvāmi_ to one Buḍapaseṭṭi.[98]

The office was also hereditary in Mediaeval Karnataka.[99] As Appadorai points out, it is possible that the leadership was in some instances hereditary.[100]

---

95. _Ibid_., 4.
96. _Ibid_., 64.
97. _EC_, X, Bp.72.
98. _Ibid_., 83.
99. Dikshit, _op.cit._, pp.156-157.
100. Appadorai, _op.cit_., I, p.386.

The *Pattanasetti* appears to have been in charge of the administration of the municipal or urban areas where guilds existed.[101] He was the headman of the city. There could be more than one *pattanasvami* in one place depending upon its size. An Anekal inscription of A.D.1412 to which reference was made before records that Dandi Setti and Tirumalasetti were the *Pattanasvamis* of a certain place (not mentioned).[102] A Holalkere inscription of A.D.1534 refers to the *pattanasvami* Mallisetti and Viri Setti.[103] We have also referred to the *setti-pattanasvami* of the various suburbs of the city of Vijayanagara, namely Tirumaladeviyara-pattana, Varadarajammanapattana, and Krishnapura.[104] The town of Kalise in Keladi-sime had more than one *pattanasvami*.[105]

His Remuneration and Functions:

The principal source of his income was his *manya* land. In A.D.1362 Periya Nayaka, the *Pattanasvami* of the fair at Kayivara was granted land, free of all imposts.[106] In A.D. 1412, Dandi-setti and Tirumalasetti were granted land specified as a *manya*, with freedom from tolls.[107] In A.D.1426,

---

101. Mahalingam, *Ec.Life*, p.32.
102. *EC*, IX, An.44.
103. *EC*, XI, Hk.17.
104. *SII*, IX (ii) No.573.
105. *MAR*, 1930, No.60.
106. *EC*, X. Ct.95.
107. *EC*, IX, An.44.

Budapa-setti was given the office of Pattanasvami together with a manya.[108] In A.D.1430, Chiyi Bassi setti of Maragal, was granted land.[109] In A.D.1554, Vithanne-Nayaka granted estates to the Pattanasvami (name not given).[110]

The headship of the town and the management of the fair were his principal duties. The expenses of the fair were met by collecting customs dues and tolls, and they constituted another source of his income. An inscription of A.D.1378 records that in the Ramesvaram village where a fair was established, grain entering the fair wholesale would be free of all dues for one year. After that among others, the lordship dues and the five settis dues (specified) were to be levied.[111] We have numerous records in which the pattanasvami gifted the toll revenue raised in the fair for the service of the local god.[112]

Voice in Revenue Matters:

The Setti-pattanasvami figures in revenue matters. This is clear from inscriptions. In A.D.1525, Lingarasa of Dharapura issued orders to settis, senabovas and local and foreign merchants residing in Velupadige (Krishnarayapura), fixing the rate of taxes in the new bazaar street opened in

---

108. EC, X, Bp.83.
109. Ibid., 152.
110. EC, VI, Tk.69.
111. EC, X, Sd.112.
112. SII, IX (ii), No.523,
Ibid., No.530,
Ibid., No.584.

the name of the king as follows: "No taxes are to be levied during the first three years; then a Varaha per oil-mill; 3 panas for a weaving machine; 3 panas for a stall; if the weaving machines are kept by a single family only nine are to be taxed; a pana for a stall of minor articles; all these are to be collected over a year."[113] Similarly, in A.D.1535, Abbarāja Timmapa, agent to the Pradhāna Tirumalarāya made a gift of the mūlavisa (cess) with the consent of the Settipattanasvāmis of Tirumaladēviyarapattana, Varadarājamunanapattana and Krishnapura, all suburbs of the city of Vijayanagara.[114] It is clear from these two inscriptions that the settipattanasvāmis had charge of tax collection and that they had a voice in revenue administration. The settipattanasvāmi was assisted by the sēnabōva (accountant) who was another officer of the town.

The pattanasvāmi levied and collected the toll-revenue at fairs. An inscription of A.D.1538 records that Viranna-Nāyaka got a gift made of the toll and other revenue raised in the fair held on every Friday at Lakkanapura by the Settis and pattanasvāmis to the service of the Goddess Mahālakshmīdēvi of Haruhe Lakkhanepura.[115] Inscriptions give evidence of making a gift of toll-revenue at fairs for services in temples. In A.D.1528, Mallapanna of Elabarige caused the construction

113. Ibid., No.516.
114. Ibid., No.573.
115. Ibid., No.584.

of a shop or stall and made a gift of the same, together with the toll-revenue of the fair held in Malapura to the god Sūryanārāyaṇadēva.[116] In A.D.1529-30 there was a gift of the revenue raised in the bazaar street of Vijaya-Virūpapura (that is, at Kampli, Hospet Taluk) for the service of the god Mallikārjunadēva.[117] In A.D.1530, the toll-revenue raised in the fair was gifted for the service of the god Bhairavadēva.[118] Further, in A.D.1545 Konēṭi Timmarāja made a gift of the toll-revenue (suṅka) raised in Ravudūr for offerings to the god Viṭṭhaladēva.[119]

Voice in Land Grants:

The consent of the paṭṭaṇasvāmi was taken in making land grants. In A.D.1545, with the consent of the gauḍa, sēnabōva and the paṭṭaṇasvāmis, Rāmarājaya made a grant of land for the service of the god Jinadēva in the basti at Kurigōḍu.[120] Similarly, the gauḍas and sēnabōvas of Niḍugalla-sīme together with the seṭṭipaṭṭaṇasvāmis made a gift of the village of Timukuṇṭe in Niḍugal-rājya for the service of the god Tiruvēṅgalanātha of Peyalabaṇḍe.[121]

A record of A.D.1366 of the time of Kampaṇṇa-oḍeya records that a certain Nāyaka made a gift of land and a part

116. Ibid., No.523.
117. Ibid., No.530.
118. Ibid., No.532.
119. Ibid., No.616.
120. Ibid., No.618.
121. Ibid., No.665.

of toll revenue of the villages Bandehalli and Mōdehalli with the consent of the nādu, nagara and nānādēśis for the service of the god Mallināthadēva of Mōdehalli. From the inscription it is clear that the nānādēśis and the nagara had a voice in revenue matters and in making gifts of land.[122] An inscription of A.D.1547 records the remission of taxes on barbers of the Amminabhāvi area in Haragalesīme at the representation of Timmōja, Kondōja and Bhadrōja by Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Śrīraṅgarāja and Rāmarāja.[123] The order was communicated to the settipattanasvāmi.

Conferring Titles and Honours:

A Belur inscription of A.D.1362[124] mentioned before, records that the merchants and the farmers of a number of towns assembled and conferred upon the famous general Muddanna-Dannāyaka, the title of Mayoralty, 'Prithvi-settitana' in return for the protection afforded to the commerce throughout the empire. This was a meeting of the merchants of all the towns mentioned, who acted cojointly to recognise the protection given to their commerce.

Section 7: The Town assembly

Nagara:

As already stated, the town or nagara was an adminis-

---

122. Ibid., No.411.
123. Bombay-Karnātak Inscriptions in ii. No.257.
124. EC, V, Bl.75.

trative unit. The term nagara was also used to denote the town assembly. Some of the other terms for the town assembly were nakara, nakhara, nagara-samūha or merely samūha. Mention was made of an inscription of A.D.1365 where the consent of the nagara was taken for making land gifts and a part of the toll revenue for the service of the god Mallinātha of Mōḍehaḷḷi. Here the word Nagara obviously refers to the town assembly. The paṭṭaṇasvāmi acted as the mayor.[125] An inscription from Malur of A.D.1435 records that Siṅga-Rāja, the paṭṭaṇasvāmi of the city Tekal, built the two lines of fortification round the city and undertook several other building activities.[126] The office of paṭṭaṇasvāmi, it may be mentioned in this connection existed even as late as A.D. 1700. An inscription of that year from Belur records that the merchants and town mayor called seṭṭipaṭṭaṇasvāmi and the Belur temple priests established a Śāsana for the washermen caste.[127] An epigraph commemorating the death of Bhairādēvi is said to have been set up by the paṭṭaṇasamudāya (congregation of the town).[128]

The town assembly was a representative body and guarded the interests of the local people. Even the paramount power of the high officials of the state ordinarily

---

125. SII, IX (ii), No.411.
126. EC, X, Mr.4.
127. Ibid., Bl.6.
128. Panchamukhi, Karṇātak Inscriptions, I No.39 of 1939-40.

did not interfere with the rights of this assembly. Remission of taxes or making gifts of them took place with its consent.

There was a strong sense of oneness among its members.[129] Its members were at times known as nagarattār.[130] ~~Like the village Sabha, the nagara or the guild in the town was divided into committees.~~ The nagara-Karṇattār[131] (accountants) and the nagara-madhyastha were among the officers of the nagara.[132]

Nagaramu, Nakharamu, Nakaramu an organization of traders are mentioned in the Telugu records of this period. Members of the Nagaramu, both individually and collectively describe themselves as Nagarēśvara or Nakarēśvara-pāda-padmārādhakulu or worshippers of the holy feet of god Nagarēśvara or Nakarēśvara.[133] In A.D.1402, certain seṭṭis agreed to a grant for the worship, festivals and all ceremonies of the god Nagarēśvara.[134] Again, in A.D.1433, a grant of land was made by Īsara Seṭṭi for keeping a perpetual lamp before the god Nakharēśvara and feeding a fixed number of Brahmans in the temple on special days.[135] The deities were so called obviously because of being installed by the Nagaramu or Nakharamu.

---

129. Mahalingam, SIP, p.394.
130. SII, VIII, No.68.
131. SII, V, No.592.
132. Ibid., No.592; Ibid., VII, No.1031.
133. Ibid., X, No.429.
134. EC, IX, Bn.96.
135. SII, X, No.429.

The Vaiśyapurāṇamu by Bhāskarāchārya is a Telugu-kāvya purported to have been written in A.D.1508. According to this work Nagara organizations existed in many towns and cities throughout the country and they were all united in a countrywide organization which was hierarchical in character. Nagara organizations existed in eighteen different places. These were Dharma, Dhanada, Pāñchāla, Nire Vadya, Jagannādha, Kshīrakāsāra, Demdulūru, Elā, Ghaṇṭasāla, Triguṇitabhīma (the three Bhimavarams), Viśākha Kaliṅga, Nṛsiṁha, Vīranārāyaṇa, Āchanṭa and Penugoṇḍa.[136] The members of the Nagaramu were well-known in the towns and cities of Veṅgi-deśa. There appears to have been a Deśa unit of the Nagaramu. The deśa or district was a well-known territorial unit of the time. Penugoṇḍa appears to have been their chief city, the headquarters. We get a description of Penugoṇḍa.[137] The other seventeen places were Grāsa-grāmas or supporting villages. Nagaramu was a federation of trade guilds.

The city unit was administered by a council whose members were known as Nagarasvāmulu or paṭṭanasvāmulu or nagareśvara.[138] The council would meet in the palace of the Nagareśvara, and the members were properly seated.[139] The place of the

136. Bhāskarāchārya, Vaiśyapurāṇamu (Madras, Vavilla Ramasvami sastrulu & Sons., 1929), V, Pr.36, p.46.
137. Ibid., V, 13-71.
138. Ibid., IV, V, 79; Vii, V, 108, iii.
139. Ibid., VII, V, iii.

DHARWAR

meeting was known as the mukha-mantapa.[140] Invitations were issued to the nagarasvāmis of the 18 places to attend the meeting.[141] The invitations were sent through secret agents.[142] Any member who did not turn up at the mukhamantapa for the meeting could be expelled.[143] The meeting that was held for ~~making~~ settling matters concerning Dharma was known as Dharmasabhā.[144] The head of the council of Nagarasvāmulu of the city where the headquarters was located was the President of all the Nagarams of that division. He was known as Mahimasetti. He was entitled to the honour of receiving betel leaves.[145] The meeting consisted of 150 nagarasvāmis belonging to the 18 places.[146] It was the duty of the Samayamantri to arrange for the meeting.[147]

Bidire:

The village Mūdabidure is situated on a chain of hills, twentytwo miles north-east of Mangalore. According to inscriptions, it was called Bidire, Nagara, Vaṁśapura and Veṇupura, and belonged to the province of Maṅgalūru-rājya. It is the seat of a Jaina high priest, and there are no less than sixteen Jaina temples (basti). In

---

140. Ibid., VIII, V.12.
141. Ibid., VII, V.108.
142. Ibid.,
143. Ibid., VIII, V.12.
144. Ibid., I, V.14.
145. Ibid., VIII, V.47.
146. Ibid., V. 14.
147. Ibid., VII, V.108.

Mūḍabidure, there were eight manisa Settikāras and (four) eḷame[148] ~~and (ho)~~llaradhavaru. In the epigraphs of A.D. 1476,[149] and 1571[150] from the same place, we have mention of manisa Settikāras, praje Settikāras and mandi Settikāras. These three terms manisa, praje and mandi mean the people. They (eight) occupied the position of the executive of the halaru or many which was the assembly of Bidire from the Hoysaḷa to the Vijayanagara times.

Taḷakāḍu:

In Taḷakāḍu, a sthānapati or trustee is found in charge of the administration of the town. Between A.D.933 and A.D.1334 the municipal organizations of Taḷakāḍu consisted of four paṭṭanasvāmis or mayors and the twentyfive (members) probably constituting its council, and the mahānagara or the corporation with the prajegauḍas joining the assembly, when probably, their interests were touched and a sthānapati as the officer over the whole city of Taḷakāḍu with its seven puras and the pañcaraṭha.[151]

Kundāpura in A.D.1406 had two Dhanis (chiefs) who along with others purchased a plot of land in the same village and made a gift of it.[152]

148. SII, VII, No.213.
149. Ibid., No.209.
150. Ibid., No.210.
151. MAR, 1911-12, p.37; EC, III, Ml.99, 83. MAR, 1917, p.47; Ibid., 1920, p.35; EC, III, Ml.104 and 107.
152. SII, IX (ii), No.430.

We have already referred to the assembly of Bandehalli and Mōdehalli which in A.D.1366, included the nādu, nagara and nanādēsis.[153]

From our study of the nagara or town assembly, the inference can be drawn that it was made up of the following. 1. The nagara or the various guilds of the place. 2. The prajegāundas in some cases. 3. The puras and the Brahmapuris. 4. The mathas. 5. The executive council and 6. The municipal officers.

Section 8:

Divisions of Towns:

Kēris or Quarters: Bārakūru:

The city was divided into ten quarters each called a kēri of which inscriptions of the period contain frequent references. Bārakūru was both a trading centre and the headquarters of the governor of the Bārakūrurājya. It was the largest city in South Kanara in Vijayanagara times. The Bārakūru inscription of A.D.1430,[154] of the reign of Dēva Rāya II which records an agreement between the trading communities of mūrukēri and Challikēri of Bārakūru, contains a clause reserving a particular place for the foreign

153. SII, IX (ii), No.411.
154. SII, VII, No.340.

merchants (paradēśi-bevahārigalu) to store the loads of sugar they bring from beyond the Ghats. (Ghaṭṭada mēlaninda). There are also references to manigārakēri, hattu-kēri, kōta-kēri and paduvakēri. Each kēri had its own trade guild called seṭṭikāra, nakhara and nakhara-hañjamāna.

Paḍuvakēri in Basarūru:

Basarūru was another important trade centre which was also divided into Kēris of which paḍuvakēri and mūḍakēri are referred to in the available epigraphs. They too had their trade guilds. Inscriptions contain references to the activities of the merchants of Paḍuvakēri in Basarūru.

In A.D.1436, Balabijjana Bemmaseṭṭi-Nāraṇaseṭṭi of the Baḷegāra community made a gift of some plots of land of specified boundary for feeding Brahmans in the maṭha at Paḍuvakēri in Basarūru.[155] In A.D.1442, Kōṭiyaṇṇa Seṭṭi made a gift of land for the service of the god Mahādēva at Paḍuvakēri of Basarūru, with the consent of a several Seṭṭikāras (Halaru Seṭṭikārara Suhastada voppa).[156] In A.D.1444 the several Seṭṭikāras of Paḍuvakēri gave lands to Nāraṇa Seṭṭi for offerings and service in the temple of Nakharēśvara.[157] From another inscription we get the name of another Kēri (street) in Basarūr namely Mūḍakēri.

155. SII, IX (ii), No.446.
156. Ibid., No.448.
157. Ibid., No.449.

The inscription refers to the amicable settlement of a dispute between the settis of Paduva and Mūda kēris. In A.D.1455 an agreement was effected between the settis of the two quarters, namely, Paduvakēri and Mūdakēri regarding the boundary and the rights of their respective localities, and the paths through which the Settis of each locality had to take sheep and arecanut trees to the temple of Devi on occasions of festivals.[158] An epigraph of A.D.1465 records the gift of gold, which the Hañjamāna community was paying, to the service of the god Mahādēva at Paduvakēri, on the occasions of a lunar eclipse.[159] In A.D.1472 Ballabali Duggana-setti, and his nephews Sōvanasetti, Nāganasetti, and Dēvusetti, belonging to Paduvakēri of Basurūru made a grant of some plots of lands to Siriyappa for the worship of the god Viśvanātha, which he had brought from Benares, when he returned from his pilgrimage to that place.[160] Another inscription refers to a gift of land made by the halaru of Paduvakēri. In A.D.1482 a number of residents of Basarūr and the halaru of Paduvakēri made gifts of land for the service of the god Tirumaladēva at the Paduvakēri of Basarūru.[161] In A.D. 1487 Rudrākshi-odeya, the guru of the Settikāras, built

158. Ibid., No.457.
159. Ibid., No.459.
160. Ibid., No.468.
161. Ibid., No.471.

a *matha* at the Paduvakēri of Basarūr and the *Settis* endowed the *matha* with plots of land.[162] In A.D.1510 Mallapa-nāyaka collected *Kānike* from the merchants of Paduvakēri of Basarūr for offerings and other services of the god Mahādēva.[163] In A.D.1519 Tirumaka-settiti, wife of one Nāranasetti caused the construction of a *matha* in the Paduvakēri of Basurūr and endowed it with lands and gold.[164] In A.D.1520 one Śankara-setti built a *matha* out of the gold of his grand-daughter, Tirumakka-Rāvutiti who had no children and endowed it with some plots of land. He also made a gift for the service of the god Nakharēśvara.[165] In A.D.1525 Nāranamūdila of Chennāvara of the Paduvakēri of Basrūr, and Kupanasetti caused the construction of a *matha* to Lakshmīnārāyanadēva and endowed it with lands and interest bearing grants of money outstanding on many persons.[166] In A.D.1533, Sunkanna Nāyaka made a gift of the god Tirumaladēva of Paduvakēri of Basrūr.[167] In A.D. 1555, Kōti Sarasetti, a resident of Paduvakēri in Basarūru made a grant of land k for maintaining the *Sattra* attached to his *matha*.[168] In A.D.1562 Chitusetti, belonging to Paduvakēri in Basarūru, caused the construction of *matha* and granted land for the service of the god Kōtēśvara.[169]

---

162. *Ibid.*, No.473.
163. *Ibid.*, No.479.
164. *Ibid.*, No.511.
165. *Ibid.*, No.512.
166. *Ibid.*, No.517.
167. *Ibid.*, No.555.
168. *Ibid.*, No.659.
169. *Ibid.*, No.673.

In A.D.1608 Ajji-Nāraṇa seṭṭi caused the construction of a maṭha in the Paḍuvakēri of Basarūru and endowed it with lands and money grants yielding interest.[170] Altogether inscriptions refer to six maṭhas and six temples in the two kēris of Basarūru.

Vijayanagara was also divided into pāḷems or wards. Each ward consisted of several streets. A talāri with a staff of assistants was placed in charge of each ward.[171] Each town had its own Taḷavaras. The preservation of the peace in each town and city was entrusted to a band of taḷavaras headed by a prefect.[172]

Section 9:

Guilds in South Kanara:

Hañjamāna and Nakhara:

We can now turn our attention to a discussion of the guilds of South Kanara. Hañjamāna and Nakhara find frequent references in the Vijayanagara records from South Kanara. The Nakhara guilds generally owed allegiance to Śaivism, built a number of temples dedicated to Nakharēśvara and made numerous grants for their maintenance. An inscription of A.D.1399 from Bārekūru records that the Nakhara-Hañjamāna of Hattukēri made a grant to the god Śrī Nārāyaṇa dēva.[173] Another

---

170. Ibid., No.694.
171. Venkataramanayya, N.: Studies, p.266, quoting Rāyavācakamu
172. Ibid., p.265.
173. SII, VII, No.350: Ramesh, K.V. Tuḷunāḍina Itihāsa pp.128-129.

inscription of A.D.1405[174] from Bārakūru clearly proves that the people of the locality were not helpless against officers of the government who wronged them. We learn from this record that during the time of Harihara II as emperor, Mahābaladēva who was the governor of Bārakūru-rājya, had interfered with the office and functions of the *Seṭṭitana* of the *halaru* of *hattukēri* who included the *nakhara-hañjamāna* of the city of Bārakūru. Consequently, an appeal was made to Bukka II who directed *Mahāpradhāna* Bāchaṇṇa of Gōve (that is, Goa) to enquire into the ~~affair~~ conflict. Accordingly, Bāchaṇṇa, paid a visit to Bārakūru, conducted an enquiry and arranged for compensation to the aggrieved parties. The appeal to the emperor was made by the *sthānapati* of the *hattukēri* of Bārakūru, Chikkaṇṇa. It is interesting to note that Bāchaṇṇa-oḍeya, who settled this problem, was subsequently made the governor of Bārakūru-rājya.[175] An inscription from Mūḍabidure of A.D. 1419[176] records the compensation (*parihāra*) that was given to the *Hañjamāna-Nakhara*. We gather from this inscription that Timmaṇṇa-oḍeya, the governor of Mangalūrurājya was involved in an affair with the *Hañjamāna*. It records that while they were conducting themselves in accordance with established rules and custom, Timmaṇṇa-oḍeya, without any

---

174. *Ibid.*, No.211.
175. *Ibid.*, IX (ii), No.435.
176. *Ibid.*, VII, No.182.

reason, attacked the Hañjamāna with his soldiers and laid waste four or five villages under their jurisdiction. The news reached the emperor, the general and Bayichadaṇṇāyaka who instructed Timmappa-oḍeya to offer reparations to the injured Hañjamāna. The latter obeyed the instruction after holding an enquiry with the help of his Pradhānis, some chieftains (specified) and the Samasta-Kaṭṭaḷe. According to an inscription from Yermāl, Udipi Taluk,[177] there were 1000 warriors (Sāvirāḷu) of the Samastahalaru. It is possible to infer from this that these guilds had their own armed followers to give protection to their respective guilds. We learn from the Kaikini inscription of A.D. 1427[178] that the nakhara-hañjamāna was powerful enough to challenge the authority of the governor and consequently invited an attack by the imperial forces. We learn from a Mūḍubidure inscription of A.D.1532[179] that by order of the eight Seṭṭikāras of the nakhara of Bidure a certain building activity was undertaken for the Chaityālaya of Bidure. These organizations were powerful, rich and influential in Vijayanagara times.

Eḷame:

Eḷame appears to have been a guild with its own building regulations. Numerous Vijayanagara inscriptions from

177. ARSIE, 1927-28, No.396.
178. Karṇātak Inscriptions, I, No.48.
179. SII, VII, No.205.

South Kanara refer to its members as elame, elamegalolagada, elamegalu, elame olagādavaru, that is those who were included in the elame. Elame is associated with a number. For example, in Vaṁśapura or Mūdabidure four and sixtysix, three hundred and sixty for Vēṇūr and seven hundred and seventy in the Hattukēri of Bārakūr. Inscriptions do not elucidate its composition and functions. We can illustrate its activities on the evidence of inscriptions.

In A.D.1429, at Mūḍubidure (Vaṁśapura), the eight seṭṭikāras of Vēṇupura, four Elames and Samastahalaru made grants for a chaityālaya and it was built.[180] Another inscription[181] from Mūḍubidure of the same year records that the eight seṭṭikāras and samasta halaru who were included in the four elame caused the construction of the second storey of the chaityālaya. An undated inscription from Vaṁśapura records that the same persons caused the construction of the third storey of the basti.[182] In A.D.1462 land gifts were made for the god Pārśvanātha with the consent of the eight praje seṭṭikāras and the four elames.[183] An epigraph of A.D.1476 records a grant to the chaityālaya by the same prajeseṭṭikāras and elames.[184] In A.D.1489, one Kāmādēvi made a grant to the chaityālaya of Śāntināthasvāmi with the consent of 516 seṭṭikāras and 300 elames. It is likely

180. SII, VII, No.196.
181. Ibid., No.202.
182. Ibid., No.209.
183. Ibid., No.198.
184. Ibid., No.209.

that all the members were present at this meeting. We come across a gift of paddy in A.D.1515 [185] by the eight settikāras and the four elames. An inscription of A.D. 1536 records a grant to the chaityālaya of Śāntīśvara, and the conservation of the twentyfour Tīrthaṅkaras in the basti with the consent of the sixteen settikāras and sixtysix elamegalu.[186] It is clear from these inscriptions that the Settikāra guild and elame guild undertook the construction of the basti (Jain temple) and made gifts to it. Halaru referred to in these inscriptions was another representative body.

Sālikeya Ballālugalu:

Sālikeya Ballālugalu stated as six in number appear to have been members of a guild of businessmen. The Sujēru inscription of A.D.1528 [187] records a compact between Tuluvarasa Bhauṭa and Vīra Narasiṁha Baṅga, prohibiting the capture by either of the parties of the ballālugalu belonging to the other. The five horahinavaru which has to be read as Sālikeya aivaru horahinavaru means outsiders. It can be inferred that they were connected with Sālike but hailed from outside Tuluva. Sālikeya ballālugalu must have been citizens of importance, and it may be that they secured for the

185. Ibid., No.212.
186. Ibid., No.256.
187. ARSIE, 1930-31, No.336.

Ballālu traders, commodites from outside the Tulu country.

Bārakūru, Basarūru, Mūdabidure and Vēnūru were important townships in South Kanara which had trade guilds whose jursidiction and activities governed several aspects of the lives of the people.

Local traders entered into agreements with the traders bringing their commodities from outside for sale and thus afforded them protection. The Bārakūru inscription of A.D.1430 [188] of the reign of Dēva Rāya II which was mentioned before, records an agreement between the trading communities of mūrukēri and chaḷikēre of Bāvakūru which contains a clause setting apart a particular place (thāvu) for the foreign merchants (paradēśi-bevaharigalu) to store the loads of sugar they bring from beyond the Ghats (Ghaṭṭada mēlaninda).

Seṭṭikāra:

The Seṭṭikāra guilds in South Kanara appear to have generally belonged to the Jaina faith. We have referred to their activities in Mūḍabidure where they built or renovated many of the Jaina bastis and made grants for their maintenance. We learn from the inscriptions that the Seṭṭikāra guild was

188. SII, VII, No.340.

made of three members (*mūvaru*) in the case of *mūru-kēri*, *chauliya-kēri* and *manigārakēri*, of four members (*nālvaru*) in the case of *Kōtakēri* and of sixteen members (*hadinaru mandi*) in the case of *hattu-kēri* (these *Kēris* were among the various quarters in Bārakūru city). We have already referred to the activities of this guild in our discussion of the activities of the *settis* of *Paduvakēri* in Basarūru.

Inscriptions refer to the high calibre of the men who were included in these organizations. An inscription from Mūdabidure[189] refers to the members of the *settikāra* guild and the *samasta halaru* of Bidire as well-versed in the sciences, as builders and renovators of new and old chaityas and as possessing all noble qualities.

Before concluding our discussion on guilds in South Kanara, it should be pointed out that in South Kanara there were representative bodies such as the *nadu*. *ūru* and the *mahājanas*. We have referred to the *okkalu*, *jagattu* and *janani* or *janni* which were the assemblies of ordinary citizens. Their members were also chosen on merit. An inscription from Mūdubidure[190] refers to the *mahājanas* of that town with such lofty epithets as *parapurushārtha-kārigal*, *dāna-sīlar*, *gurujana-bhaktar*, *kavi-janastutar*, *paramadayāparar* etc. These trade and citizens guilds and their officials were collectively referred to, inthe field of administration,

---

189. [redacted] *Ibid*., No.196.
190. *Ibid*., No.202.

as the Kattaleyavaru or samasta-kattaleyavaru. In A.D.1437,[191] the samasta-kattaleyavaru of the hattukeri of Barakuru had acted as the arbitrators in a serious dispute between the imperial governor Annappa-odeya and the residents of Sivalli. From this we can draw the inference that they helped the imperial governor in matters of administration. The imperial authorities also understood and conceded the importance of these organizations and the sanction accorded to them by local tradition. An inscription of A.D.1405[192] from Barakuru informs us that the emperor Bukka II restored to the Samasta halaru, including the nakhara-hanjamana of the hattukeri of Barakuru, all their rights and privileges and their conventional status, which had earlier been taken away from them by the imperial governor Mahabaladeva.

Mahalingam observes, "In the modern day one notices increasing recognition of the power, importance and influence of group life, trade unions, professional associations, citizens leagues etc. Such organizations in some form or other existed in ancient and mediaeval India enjoying great powers of initiative and organization in local matters. Among them were the nanadesis, nad, Ayyavole, craft guilds, the sabha, the Ur etc.,"[193] In the Vijayanagara period guilds played an important part in administration. They enriched the amenities of the people and thus supplemented the work of government, and carried on their work in a corporate manner. As Mahalingam says, "There was no field of activity, political, economic and social in which the guilds did not make their influence felt."[194] The activities of the guilds are evidence of the commendable spirit of solidarity and cooperative spirit among the different organized groups in society throughout the country in the Vijayanagara empire.

191. Ibid., No.296.
192. Ibid., No.349.
193. Mahalingam, SIP, p.21.
194. Mahalingam, Economic Life, p.34.

CHAPTER VI

C O N C L U S I O N

We have now come to the end of our account of the local bodies in the Vijayanagara empire, their organization, structure and functions. Before closing our work, some results of this inquiry may now be indicated.

The first characteristic feature of local bodies in the Vijayanagara period is that they present a great variety. There were the village assembly, the Mahājana assembly, the Mahānādu and the Nādu assemblies, the town assembly and the numerous guild organizations.

Secondly, from our survey, it is clear that local institutions did not die during the Vijayanagara period, and that they were self-governing. This is made clear by their numerous useful activities which enriched the amenities of the average citizen and contributed to the general welfare of the people. These bodies exercised the three functions of modern government, legislative, executive and judicial. The village assembly known by various names such as Ūru, Okkalu, Praje, Halaru, Janani, Jagattu, Gancari, the mahājana assembly in the agrahāra and the nādu assembly in the Nādu, as we have seen, sold or acquired lands for charitable or public utility purposes, collected and remitted taxes, levied fresh ones, administered justice in some cases, had a controlling influence over the temples within their jurisdiction and did a variety

of other public duties. Thus they were connected with the regulation, supervision and control of the economic, social and religious life of the people. They carried out municipal duties also and helped the general administration. The Mahānāḍu and other big assemblies also devoted themselves to promote the betterment of society. Similarly the Nagara or the town assembly in which guilds played an important part was concerned with municipal duties, and regulated the civic life within its jurisdiction. The numerous activities of these local bodies are clear evidence of the large measure of autonomy which they exercised in their respective territorial administrative units.

Thirdly, these local institutions were representative in character and hence must have been popular. The village assembly as we have seen was composed of the grāmaḍa gauḍagaḷu (village farmers) or the Okkalu (meaning both households and cultivators) or the Samasta Prajegaḷu (all the people) or the halaru (~~several guilds~~). The Gauḍike or the office of village headman was a coveted one. He was the chief executive of the village assembly. In the Mahājana assembly, the share-holders in the agrahāra were members, and they had their popular leaders known as Buddhivantaru, Grāmahebbāruva, Prabhu, Oḍeya Mūligaru, etc. The Nāḍu assembly consisted of the headmen of the villages representing their villages, representatives of the inhabitants of the nāḍu and as we saw, sometimes, the

DHARWAR

merchant guilds and the agrahāras were also represented. Community of interest led to the organization of guilds which safeguarded the interests of its members who followed the same calling. The guild organization also performed municipal duties. Its president, the pattanasvāmi was sometimes the town mayor. The town assembly also included the praje gāuṇḍas, representatives of the puras, the mathas and municipal officers. Thus all these local bodies consisted of the representatives of the people and one is impressed by their representative character.

Fourthly, in these local bodies decisions were taken in a collective manner. Their corporate spirit is admirable. We can draw this inference from the manner in which discussions were held and decisions taken. We have referred to the expressions that are used in inscriptions, namely Voppi or having agreed, Sarvaikamatyavāgi, Aikasvāmyavāgi, Vaḍambaṭṭu etc., in order to indicate that the decisions taken were unanimous. This must have been the result of discussions. The Nagara organizations which existed in different towns and in particular the municipal administration of Penugoṇḍa reveal the democratic spirit which prevailed in their functioning. Thus public opinion must have influenced their deliberations and these bodies were popular.

Finally, the Vijayanagara rulers do not appear to have done anything to curb their autonomous character, though on account of the continuous warfare on the northern border, these institutions became weak in that area. Also, after the days of Kṛishṇadēva Rāya, feudatories became stronger and their rise contributed to the decline of the self-governing institutions in the days following the battle of Rakkasa-Taṅgaḍi (Tāḷikōṭa). Further, the decline of trade with the fall of Vijayanagara brought about the weakening of the guild organization. The Vijayanagara rulers were not against the local institutions. They had a sympathetic attitude towards them and allowed them to continue. But the circumstances mentioned above were not favourable to their continuation.

APPENDIX

TEMPLES AND MATHAS

Section 1:

Introductory:

Temple administration was an important branch of local government in the medieval South India polity. In this connection Mahalingam observes, "besides being an active centre of religious life in the local area, the temple was an important social institution that filled a large place in the many sided activities of the township, political, social, economic and cultural."[1] Here it is proposed to make a case study of the administration of the Tirupati temple to understand the part played by temples in local administration. We derive our knowledge of the famous temple and its administration from the Tirumalai-Tirupati Dēvasthānam inscriptions.

Section 2:

Royal Benefactions:

The Tirupati temple was maintained by royal benefaction and public patronage. Royal benefaction took various forms. Kings granted villages and lands, made over taxes due to the state to the temple, and gave cash awards. All these were

---

1. Mahalingam, SIP, p.372.

to be utilised for various services and festivals in the temple. In all these cases, the Sthānattār or trustees of the temple received the grant. An agreement was made between the donee and the Sthānattār by which the Sthānattār undertook to protect the charity. It was committed to writing by the temple accountant by order of the Śrī-Vaishṇavas of the locality or the Sthaladavaru or Sthānattār. The records are usually agreements between the Sthānattār and the donor. But, in case the donor was the ruler, his name comes first followed by the Sthānattār of the temple. The temple was a registry office so that the records lasted long. This must have been the reason for engraving them on the temple walls, pillars and doorways. Moreover this habit of registration had behind it a truly business-like and historic instinct.

Some examples of royal benefactions are given below to illustrate what has been said above:

1. In A.D.1429, Dēva Rāya II granted to the temple treasury twelve thousand honnu out of the income of the Rāja-Bhandāra (royal treasury). Further, he granted tax-free the villages of Vikramādityamaṅgala, Elamandiya and Kaleruviddale for conducting a festival (specified).[2] The Śāsana was executed

---

2. TTDS, I, No.192.

by the Sthānattār of Tirumalai andwritten by the temple accountant with the permission of the Śrī-Vaishṇavas of the locality.

2. According to an epigraph of A.D.1456, Sāḷuva Narasiṅgadēva Mahārāja granted a Sarvamānya (tax-free) grant of Alipuram village in Chandragiri rājya, for the purpose of propitiating Śrī Veṅkaṭēśa, and to that effect an agreement was made with the Sthānattār. It was written by the temple accountant.[3]

According to the Dēvasthānam inscriptions, Krishṇadeva Rāya made seven visits to the temple of Śrī Veṅkaṭēśa at Tirumalai. Eight inscriptions record in three languages Telugu, Tamil and Kannada the presentation of Ratna-Kirīṭam (crown) by him as well as the gifts made by his two queens Chinnājidēvi and Tirumaladēvi during his first visit in A.D. 1513.[4] His two queens presented gold cups to Veṅkaṭēśa.[5] The kings second visit was in the same year without his queens, when he presented a number of ornaments.[6] During his third visit again A.D.1513, he granted three villages Chatravādi, Turūru and Karikambudu to the temple.[7] His fourth visit took place in A.D.1514, when he presented ornaments and granted the Taḷilpākkam village.[8] During his fifth

---

3. Ibid., II, No.4.
4. Ibid., III, Nos. 32 to 39.
5. Ibid., Nos. 40 and 50.
6. Ibid., Nos. 60 to 63.
7. Ibid., No.60.
8. Ibid., Nos. 66 to 68.

visit in A.D.1517, he presented ten thousand Varahas and a valuable padakam (pendant).[9] There is no positive mention made of his sixth visit, which is said to have been made with his senior queen Tirumaladēvi, on 16th October 1518 A.D.[10] On the occasion of his seventh visit in A.D. 1521, he presented among other things, ten thousand gold Varahas.[11] Thus, on each occasion, when he visited Śrī Veṅkaṭēśa, he made numerous and invaluable gifts including five villages.[12] The king dedicated his Telugu prabandha, Āmuktamālyada to Śrī Veṅkaṭēśa. Śrī Veṅkaṭēśa must have been in all probability, his patron God.

In A.D.1531, Achyuta Rāya provided steps of granite to the sacred Chakratīrtham situated in Tirupati.[13] In A.D.1535 he gave three hundred rēkhai-pon (gold coin) from the villages situated in Koṇḍavīḍu district for the celebration of a festival (specified).[14] In the same year, he made a further endowment of sixty rēkhaipon to be collected from the villagers situated in the province of Koṇḍavīḍu for the celebration of a monthly festival.[15]

An epigraph of A.D.1554 records that Sadāśiva Rāya granted certain taxes in sixteen provinces for the purpose of conducting certain charities in Tirupati.[16]

---

9. Ibid., No.80.
10. 697 of 1922.
11. TTDI, III, No.83.
12. Ibid., p.124.
13. Ibid., IV, No.8.
14. Ibid., No.54.
15. Ibid., No.58.
16. Ibid., No.154.

Benefactions were also made by the queens, viceroys, ministers commanders, palace officers, royal officers, royal purōhit, subordinate officers and feudatories. In all these instances, grants were made to the Sthānattār. A few examples may be given of benefactions made by ministers.

1. In A.D.1408, the Sthānattār of Tirumalai executed on stone a record in favour of Śrī Mādhavadāsar alias Mallaṇṇagal. He restored at his own cost the old channel which ran from the Mudari river to the tank in Avilālā with the result that 5000 Kuḷi of land were levelled and cultivated. Their yield was increased and in lieu of the interest on the said investment the Sthānattār agreed to supply four nāḷi ofrice measured with pulse, salt, pepper and curds for one Tiru-ppōnakam (food offering) daily, to be conducted on his name.[17]

2. Amātyaśēkhara (chief minister) Mallaṇa provided a sumptuous naivēdyam (oblation), and a splendid nityadīpam (perpetual light) for Śrī Veṅkaṭēśa.[18]

3. In A.D.1511 the Sthānattār executed a document on stone in favour of Sāḷuva Timmarasayyar who granted the Parantalūr village for the temple.[19]

---

17. Ibid., I, No.194.
18. Ibid., No.195.
19. Ibid., III, Nos. 21 & 22.

4. In A.D. 1545, Rāmarājya granted Paduppettu village yielding an annual income of two hundred rēkhai-pon for the purpose of conducting a certain festival, daily worship and other services to Śrī Venkatēśa and Śrī Gōvindarājan. The Sthānattār executed the document.[20]

5. According to an epigraph of A.D.1547, Rāmānuja granted ten thousand Kuḷi of lands in Prodattur village.[21]

6. In A.D.1554, he granted four villages yielding an annual income of four thousand rēkhai-pon for 200 tiruppōnakam daily for Śrī Venkaṭēśa.[22]

The following are some of the inscriptions which record agreements registered by the Sthānattār in favour of viceroys and feudatories.

VICEROYS:

1. In A.D.1535, Rāmabhaṭṭar of Chandragiri prepared and installed Raghunāthan (an image of Śrī Rāma) in the shrine constructed by him at his own cost in his agrahāra known as Tiruvenkaṭapuram, a western suburb of Tirupati, and made arrangements for daily offerings.[23]

2. In A.D.1541, he paid three thousand six hundred narpaṇam into the temple treasury for certain offerings. As a further

20. Ibid., III, No.21 & 22.
21. Ibid., V, No.29.
22. Ibid., No.155.
23. Ibid., IV, No.61.

donation, he granted Alambakkam village yielding an annual income of one hundred and fifty rekhai-pon for certain offerings to Śrī Veṅkaṭeśa.[24]

FEUDATORIES:

1. In A.D. 1518, Bahūr Mallarasayyar gave three hundred and sixty paṇam to be invested for the excavation of irrigation channels in the temple villages. From the income derived, the Sthānattār had to supply certain articles (enumerated) for the preparation of certain offerings.[25]

2. Lakka Nāyakkar paid one thousand five hundred paṇam to the temple treasury in A.D.1529.[26]

3. In A.D. 1521, Subuddhi Rāmadāsar granted the villages of Tandalam and Ambikamudusila-Tadapalam.[27]

4. The epigraph of A.D. 1533 records that the Sthānattār registered the gifts of six thousand paṇam by Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Timmarāja Salakarāja for maintaining a water-shed in the Maṇṭapam constructed by him on the way to Tirumalai hills.[28]

5. In A.D. 1546, Śrīpati Ōbaleśvara rāja granted the Perūr village yielding an annual income of three hundred gaṭṭivarāham (gold coin) for the purpose of propitiating Śrī Veṅkaṭeśa.[29]

---

24. Ibid., No.154.
25. Ibid., III, No.127.
26. Ibid., No.137.
27. Ibid., No.147.
28. Ibid., IV. No.25.
29. Ibid., V. No.25.

Section 3:

Public Patronage:

Innumerable epigraphs record gifts by private individuals. As in the case of royal benefactions, here also, the grants were registered by the Sthānattār. The following are a few examples of private charities:-

1. In A.D. 1475 Śaṭhakōpadāsar Narasiṁharāya Mudaliar, one of the Śrīvaishṇavas of Tirupati paid two hundred paṇam as a capital into the temple treasury for certain offerings to Śrī Veṅkaṭēśa.[30]

2. In A.D.1494, Kuḷattuḷār Pudolial var Veṅkaṭaseṭṭi Nārāyaṇan, one of the merchants of Tirupati constructed a Maṇṭapam and made provision for certain offerings to Śrī Veṅkaṭēśa.[31]

3. In A.D.1513, the Sthānattār of Tirupati registered a gift made by Tiruveṅkaṭamuḍaiyār. The latter paid one hundred and fifty naṟ-paṇam for certain offerings.[32]

4. In A.D.1528, the Sthānattār issued a record on stone in favour of Pevula Mannappayar who gave three thousand paṇam into the temple treasury which was to be utilised for the excavation of irrigation tanks and channels in the temple villages, and out of the produce derived thereby certain

30. Ibid., II, No.63.
31. Ibid., No.112.
32. Ibid., III, No.31.

offerings (specified) were to be made to lord Venkatēśa.[33]

5. In A.D.1530, Kumāra Rāmānujayyangār, manager of Rāmānujakūṭams of Tirumalai and in Tirupati, and the guardian of the gold treasury of the Tirumalai temple constructed a wooden car for Śrī Rāma enshrined in Tirupati.[34]

6. In A.D.1547 Udayagiri Dēvarāja Bhaṭṭar arranged for the collection of fifty two rēkhaipon to be collected yearly from the merchants of Tirupati for the expenditure of the various items in the temple.[35]

Section 4:

Temple Administration:

It is clear from inscriptions that the management of the temple affairs was in the hands of the Sthānattār who registered the deeds of charity made by the donors, and who undertook to protect them. They were the Sthaladavaru or the local people.

Inscriptions refer to a number of temple officials. Mention has already been made of the temple accountant who drew up the temple records and maintained the accounts. During the time of Kṛishṇadēva Raya, the following persons held the job:-

1. Tiruninraūruḍaiyārgaḷ[36]

33. Ibid., No.176.
34. Ibid., IV, No.1.
35. Ibid., V, No.100.
36. Ibid., III, Nos. 121 and 134.

2. Kuppa Veṅkaṭattarasu[37]

3. Appakkoṇḍār[38]

4. Śrīnivāsan[39]

5. Kuppayyam[40]

6. Villiyar[41]

An inscription of A.D.1575[42] mentions the following temple officials:-

1. Sthānattār
2. Nambimārs (temple priests)
3. Anusandhānam (reciters of Vēdas & Prabandhas)
4. Tēvai (temple cooks)
5. Kaṅgāṇippān (supervisor)
6. Tiruppaṇipiḷḷai (temple repairers)
7. Adhikāri (manager)
8. Kaikkōḷars (servants)
9. Śippiyār (masons)
10. Maṇṭapakkottar (mantapam repairers)
11. Tiruvidhiśāni (temple damsels)

Inscriptions also refer to the manager of the Rāmānujakūṭams (free feeding house) at Tirumalai and in Tirupati,[43] the guardian of the gold treasury,[44] the manager of the flower garden.[45] The temple was a wealthy institution

---

37. Ibid., Nos. 138, 141 and 149.
38. Ibid., No.151.
39. Ibid., Nos.160 and 161.
40. Ibid., No.179.
41. Ibid., No.181.
42. Ibid., No.105.
43. Ibid., II, No.38.
44. Ibid., IV, No.1.
45. Ibid., I, No.187.

with movable and immovable property. It was a large employer, appointing and maintaining the servants of the temple with the temple funds.

Section 5:

Functions discharged by the temple:

Promotion of Agriculture:

The temple, as one of the biggest land owners in the locality looked after the interests of agirculture in the area. Lands were cultivated, and cultivation was extended to even uncultivated areas. There are innumerable inscriptions recording money spent on digging new channels, lands being levelled and cultivated, and thus an increase in yield was secured. A few examples are given below:-

1. An epigraph of A.D.1444 records that the Sthānattār executed a document in favour of one Mallaṇḍaiyār who constructed a river channel for irrigating lands from its source in the Nari-āṟu river for the purpose of propitiating the deity in his name.[46]

2. In A.D. 1456, the Sthānattār executed a record in favour of Kōyil-Kēḻvi Emperumānār-Jīyar to the effect that the five thousand naṟpaṇam he paid should be utilised for excavating a tank in the village Avilāli.[47]

---

46. Ibid., No.197.
47. Ibid., No.223.

3. In A.D.1467, Śrīraṅgāmbādevi-amman, queen of Sāḷuva Narasimha had an irrigation channel excavated in a temple village.[48]

4. In A.D.1507, the Sthānattār issued a śilāśasanam in favour of Tippu-seṭṭi, one of the merchants residing in Narasiṅgarāyapuram, a suburb of Tirupati to the effect that the 8305 paṇam which he gave to the temple should be used among other things for improving the tanks and channels of the temple villages.[49] Thus the temple worked for the rehabilitation of villages.

5. In A.D.1517, the Sthānattār executed a śilāśāsanam in favour of Dharmapuram Sittamu-seṭṭi to the effect that he had excavated an irrigation tank at his own cost, and levelled the land situated below the tank in a temple village, Tiramanēri.[50]

Temple treasury, a bank:

The temple had a Śrī Bhaṇḍāra (temple treasury) which served as a bank. Inscriptions record the grant of money to the temple, the interest on which was to be used for its maintenance.

1. In A.D.1527, Śaraṇu-śeṭṭiyar, one of the merchants of Tirupati paid 3700 narpaṇam as capital for the purpose of providing certain offerings.[51]

---

48. Ibid., II, No.25.
49. Ibid., III, No.11.
50. Ibid., No.118.
51. Ibid., No.171.

DHARWAR

2. In A.D.1537, Śingarāja made provision for certain offerings through a deposit of 15,000 narpanam.[52]

3. In A.D.1561, Tirumalayya-rāja, son of Mahāmandaleśvara Aravīdu Bukkarāja Rāmarāja Śrīrangarāja paid the sum of 16,500 narpanam for certain offerings.[53] The Sthānattār could also invest money for temple improvements and other services in the temple.[54]

Encouragement of learning:

The temple promoted learning. It made provision for the recitation of Dēvārams and other religious literature, for the chanting of the Vēdas and the expounding of the Epics and the Purānas. According to an inscriptions of A.D.1433, the Sthānattār registered a deed executed by Mudaliyār Tirukkalikanridāsan, one of the Śrīvaishnavas of Tirupati, in favour of twentyfour Mahājanas residing in Śrīnivāsapuram agrahāra. It records that since Vēdapārāyanam ceased to be conducted, Tirukkalikandidāsan Alagappiranār represented to Dēvana Udaiyār that Vēdapārāyanam be resuscitated as the charity of Dēvarāja Mahārāya. He obtained half the share of the Rājabhandāra (royal treasury) in Siddhakkuttai, and

52. Ibid., IV, No.88.
53. Ibid., V, No.168.
54. Ibid., III, No.127.

made it over to twenty-four persons. It was insufficient for their support, and they requested the *Sthānattār* that the other half share of the Śrībhaṇḍāra be also granted to them. The *Sthānattār* accordingly authorised the twenty-four *mahājanas* to take possession of the portion and enjoined them to render *Vēdapārāyaṇam* through two persons from among themselves every day.[55]

The temple promoted education by giving support to *maṭhas* which were also centres of learning. In A.D. 1524 the *Sthānattār* registered a document on stone in favour of Śrīmat-Vyāsatīrtha Śrīpāda Uḍaiyār by which he was given a house site to build his own *maṭham* (Vyāsarāyamaṭham).[56]

From our study of the Tirupati temple, it is clear that the management of the temple was in the hands of the local Śrīvaishṇava people. In this connection S.K. Aiyangar observes that the Tirupati temple management "remained altogether autonomous, and under the control of the Śrīvaishṇavas of the locality."[57] The whole body of the inscriptions makes clear the autonomous character of the temple administration. The government kept altogether away from the day to day management. At the same time it was watchful and came down with a heavy hand whenever there were cases of embezzlement by the temple officers and consequent mismanagement. We come across one such instance during the time of Sāḷuva Narasiṁha. Nambi Śiṟṟappaiyan,

---

55. *Ibid.*, I, Nos.199-202.
56. *Ibid.*, III, No.157.
57. Aiyangar, S.K. *A History of Tirupati* (2 Vols. Madras 1940) I, p.449.

one of the temple priests committed theft of temple jewels for which his house and house sites were ordered to be confiscated to the temple.[58] S.K. Aiyangar rightly observes, "while the control was exercised efficiently, there was no day to day interference from the government in the day to day management of the affairs of the temple."[59] From the foregoing study of the Tirupati temple, we can infer that temples played an important part in local administration as a landlord and employer, as a bank and as a promoter of education besides being a centre of religious life.

MATHAS

Section 6:

Introductory:

Just as the study of the administration of the Tirupati temple afforded an example of the role of temples in local administration, a study of the Śriṅgēri *matha* helps us to understand the part played by *mathas* in local administration.

Śriṅgēri or Ṛṣyaśriṅgagiri, to give its full name, is situated on the left bank of the Tuṅga river in a taluka

58. TTDI, III, No.158.
59. Aiyangar, S.K. A History of Tirupati, II, p.432.

fertile tract near the Western Ghats. The head of the *maṭha* is styled the *Jagad-guru* (*guru* of the world) who has great influence and extensive authority.

Guruvaṁśamahākāvya or *History of Successive teachers of Śriṅgēri Maṭh* by Kāśi Lakshmaṇa Śāstri, a contemporary of Śrī Saccidānanda Bhārati (A.D.1705-41), is an important source of information.[60] The author begins with Śaṅkarāchārya, the accredited founder of the Śriṅgēri *maṭha*. Up to the time of Śrī Bhārati Kṛṣṇatīrtha and Śrī Vidyāraṇya, Śriṅgēri was a cluster of hermitages, the chief avocation of the *gurus* being learning and penance. It was a centre of religious and philosophical culture. The *gurus* did not have to manage any *Jahagirs* and land endowments. With the arrival of Vidyāraṇya, there was a transformation. He played a prominent part in the early history of the Vijaya-nagara empire, and secured from the Emperors of Vijayanagara rich land endowments, money, materials and a number of *birudas* (honours and titles). The *maṭha* was converted into a semi-sovereign state. Venkataraman rightly says, "the pontificate of Śrī Bhārati Kṛṣṇatīrtha and Śrī Vidyāraṇya witnessed the conversion of Śriṅgēri, hitherto a cluster of hermitages into an *imperium et impera*".[61] The conversion was more by accident than by design. As Venkataraman says,

---

60. See MAR, 1928, *Śriṅgēri Maṭh and its gurus*, pp.15-21.

61. Venkataraman, *The Throne of Transcendental Wisdom*, (Tiruchirapalli, 1959), p.47.

"the creation of the Samsthānam marks the expression of reverence and gratitude on the part of the early emperors of Vijayanagar who were deeply conscious of the debt they owed to the Jagadgurus whose spiritual benediction and guidance helped them to found and consolidate one of the greatest empires known to Indian history."[62] It is this transformation from the hermitage into the samsthānam that gives the matha a place in local administration.

Section 7:

Royal Benefactions:

The land grants of Harihara I, Bukka I, and Harihara II provided the nucleus around which the Śringēri Samsthānam grew. The 'semi-sovereign' status of the Samsthānam was maintained by the successive rulers of the Vijayanagara empire and also the British administrators.

The first land grant of Śringēri matha was that of Harihara I in A.D.1346. An inscription of that date[63] from Śringēri, one of the earliest in Vijayanagara history, records the original endowments of the matha granted by Harihara and the other sons of Sangama and their relatives to Bhāratī-tīrtha-Śrīpāda. It professes to have been issued in celebration of the festival of Harihara's victory

62. Ibid., p.48.
63. EC, VI, Sg.1.

over all the countries from the eastern to the western ocean. It records that Vira-Hariyapoḍeyar, Muddapoḍeyar, son-in-law Bullappa-daṇṇāyaka, Kumāra Sōvaṇṇoḍeyar and others made to Bhāratī-tīrtha-Śrīpāda, his disciples and others and the forty Brahmans, residing in Śṛiṅgēri nine villages belonging to Kela-nāḍ in Sāntaḷige-nāḍ, after deducting 150 ga for the cultivators of Sāntaḷige-nāḍ for various taxes. The nine villages were Heddase, Honnahoḷe, Babbi, Haravari, Bellūru, Ambalūru, Beḷandūru, Halaka and Hosaūru. The grant was made for the "undisputed performance of Śrī-Bhāratī Kṛṣṇatīrtha Śrī Pādaṅgaḷavaru's tapas and the maintenance of resident ascetics, attendants and disciples."

A record dated A.D.1356[64] and inscribed on a stone to the north of the Gaṇapati Vāgīśvari temple, opens with a homage to ŚrīVidyātīrtha, and records a gift of land of the revenue of three hundred gadyāṇas. Bukka I made this grant during his visit to the Vidyāśaṁkara temple. A subsequent land grant of Bukka[65] was of the value of two hundred and twenty-two and a half pagōdas in Kikundanāḍu to which was added a grant of Chikka-Rāya (afterwards Harihara II) of land in Kikundanāḍu and Koḍanāḍu. The grants were utilised for the livelihood of the ascetics and disciples with him and of his servants.

64. MAR, 1916, p.56.
65. Ibid., p.57.

In A.D.1380 Harihara II consolidated and confirmed all the previous grants, and made an additional grant to Vidyāraṇya. In A.D.1387,[66] a further grant by Harihara was divided into 100 Vṛittis of five pagōdas each, four of which were allotted to temples, and the rest to competent scholars.[67] In A.D.1389-90, a supplemental grant of 30 Vṛittis was made. The total value of all these lands was three thousand and three pagōdas, and this gave to Śriṅgēri the name of mūrusāvira sīme. Further in A.D.1392,[68] Harihara II founded an agrahāra Hariharapura, about twelve miles from Śriṅgēri, and Śrī Rāmachandra Sarasvati was the first first Āchārya of the Maṭha that was established there.

What must have been the next grant is mentioned in a very much later inscription[69] from Śriṅgēri of A.D.1652 which records that two agrahāras called Śriṅgapura and Vidyāraṇyapura were constructed and given to learned Brahmans, and in gratitude to Vidyāraṇya's services Harihara established the maṭha at Śriṅgēri. It says, "Harihara-mahārāya made petition, at the feet of Vidyāraṇya, representing that in Śriṅgapura, in (connection with) the dharma-pīṭha established by Śaṅkarāchārya, there must be a maṭha and agrahāra for the worship of the gods Mallikārjuna, Vidyāśaṅkarasvāmi and

66. Ibid., p.56.
67. Ibid.,
68. EC, VI, Kp.49.
69. Ibid., Sg.11.

Śāradamma in the *matha*, and for the performance of the religious duties of the *Vēdas* and *Śāstras*, he set apart landed property, established the *agrahāras* of Śriṅgapura and Vidyāraṇyapura and forming 250 shares, made them over to the feet of Vidyāraṇya Bhārathī-svāmi.

Dēvarāya II granted the village Mañjugaṇi in the Honnāvara kingdom,[70] and the villages Kelagundeni and Kaigai in the Goa kingdom.[71]

The Conjeevaram plates,[72] of Krishṇadēva Rāya record the grant of two villages. In A.D.1522, Krishṇadēva Rāya made a grant of the villages of Poḍavūr and Kaṭṭuppattu to Chandrachūḍa Sarasvati, the disciple of Mahādēva Sarasvati, and at the time of the grant the name of the village Poḍevūr was changed into Kriṣhṇarāyapuram. Further, in A.D.1527, he granted the village of Udayambākkam to Sadāśiva Sarasvati and changed the name of the village at the time of the grant to Kriṣhṇarāyapura.[73]

Thus the Śriṅgēri *matha* had intimate connection with the royal house of Vijayanagara whose kings honoured its *gurus* and made pious gifts for its maintenance and support. From the beginning, the lands were held by the *gurus* not as their personal property, but as a trust to preserve and spread

---

70. *MAR*, 1916, pp.60-61.
71. *Ibid.*, pp.61.
72. *EI*, XIII, pp.122-132.
73. Copper plates Nos. IV and V - *Copper plates Inscriptions belonging to the Sri Sankaracharya of the Kamakoti Pitha* edited by Gopinatha Rao, T.A. (Madras, 1916), pp.40-79.

the ideals of the pitha. Ascetics, Scholars, temples and seats of learning derived the benefits. As long as the Vijayanagara empire was in the ascendant, the Śriṅgēri establishment flourished under the royal patronage.

Section 8:

Grants from Local bodies and Private grants:

The Śriṅgēri matha was the recipient of gifts from local bodies and individuals. It also acquired property by purchase. A few examples of such transactions are given below:-

1. In A.D.1392,[74] when Narasiṁha-Bhāratī was the guru, Bommaṇṇa heggaḍe of Bēlūr and Tammarasa's son Bommaṇṇa agreeing together, made a grant of land (specified) in Bēlūr for the offerings of the god Vidyāśaṅkara. They also sold to the temple a flower garden.

2. In A.D.1401, certain hebbārs whose names are mentioned in the inscription made a grant of certain lands to Gōpinātha-Bhaṭṭa of the Śrīmatha.[75]

3. An epigraph of A.D.1406 [76] records the sale of certain lands to Kṛishṇadēva, officer of the Śrīmatha together with a gift of 43 honnu.

74. EC, VI, Sg.22.
75. Ibid., 28.
76. Ibid., 26.

4. In A.D.1408, when Chandraśēkhara Bhāratī Śrīpāda Vodeyar was the guru, Chikka-Bommaṇaheggaḍe of Heddase in Kela-nāḍ and others sold certain lands (specified) to Vishṇu Bhaṭṭa for 33 varaha, the price settled by mediators. They also arranged that the fixed rent of 3 honnu, 3 haṇa, should be paid by Jakkaṇṇa-heggaḍe to the Śrīmaṭha for the wet cultivation. In this instance the nāḍu people made over the lands (nāḍavaru dhāreyam eṛedu).[77]

5. In A.D.1419, when Purushōttama-Bhāratī-oḍeyar was the guru the heggaḍes of Kelanāḍ gave to the Śrīmaṭha a deed of sale of land for 32 honnu (Nāḍavaru poḍavaṭṭu).[78]

6. We learn from an inscription of A.D.1458 that Kariya Bommaṇaheggaḍe of Malika and the people of the Nāḍu made grants for the god Mallikārjuna and laid down the rates of expenditure. (Nāḍanu Kūḍikonḍu barasida darmmeda śilāśāsana.. ...nāḍa voppa).[79]

7. In A.D.1547, the purōhita Narasiṁhabhaṭṭa set up the god Vighnēśvara and for the offerings, perpeptual lamp and chhatra of the god, made a grant of 500 areca trees.[80]

Thus the maṭha was a rich landowner. The lands were acquired either as gifts or by purchase. It received financial help from the state and private charity.

77. Ibid., 29.
78. Ibid., 36.
79. Ibid., 30.
80. Ibid., 10.

Section 9:

Functions of the Matha:

The matha performed two important functions, namely, propogationof the Advaita philosophy of Śaṅkarāchārya and popularisation of education. It was the undisputed donor of its wealth and spent it as it thought fit without outside interference. For example, an inscription [81] of A.D.1418 records the granting of land to one Mallaṇṇa as Śrōtra-guttige (a grant of perquisite given to a Brahman to enable him to impart regular religious or secular instruction). In A.D.1524, Rāmachandra Bhāratī Oḍeyar granted a share of Kela-Bellūr village free of tax. The Śriṅgēri matha as a propagator of religion and as an educational institution, without interference from the government, played an important part in the Vijayanagara empire.

In the seventeenth century, political instability was primarily responsible for the samasthānam losing some of its holdings and valuable property. After A.D.1630, Śrīraṅga III, faced with rebellion in the south and harassment from Bijapur and Golkonda, was given asylum by the Keladi Nāyak, and lived in Bēlūr. Consequently, the Śriṅgēri samasthānam without the support of the central authority lost the outlying villages to adventurers and unscrupulous persons. Veṅkaṭappa Nāyaka

81. Ibid., 32.

DHA

(A.D.1586-1629) was the first ruler of the Keladi house to render help to Śriṅgēri. He invited the guru to his court at Ikkēri and presented him with the green flag. He put up extensions to the matha building in Śriṅgēri, founded an Agrahāra and granted land in Mukkarnād yielding more than 50 pagōdas.[82] After Vīrabhadra Nāyaka (A.D.1629-45) came to the Ikkēri throne, Bhairava, chief of Kalasa, invaded his territory and captured a slice of it which included Ikkēri. Thrice Bhairava went to Śriṅgēri and plundered its wealth. During the time of Śivappa Nāyaka (A.D.1645-60) of Ikkēri, the land and other properties of the matha were restored to the guru. He granted to the matha lands in Holehonnūr and other districts valued at more than 122 pagōdas.[83]

From the foregoing study, it can be seen that the Śriṅgēri matha was a small state within a state appointing officers to collect its revenue and spend it, and with priests to carry on the daily and special worship. It had a huge body of servants to take care of the honours of the matha. The matha acquired possessions outside Sringeri proper and enjoyed full rights over its lands. It was exempted from royal customs and taxes. The Śriṅgēri Samsthānam was empowered to enforce law and order within its jurisdiction. It was an autonomous body which contributed much to advance the religious and spiritual life of the people and spread learnigg.

82. Ibid., 5; MAR, 1928, p.15.
83. MAR, 1928, p.17, para 43.

ABBREVIATIONS

Admn.	Administration and Social Life Under Vijayanagar by T.V. Mahalingam.
ARSIE	Annual Reports of South Indian Epigraphy. The inscriptions copied in particular years and published in the reports are referred to as 1 of 1887, 65 of 1922 etc.,
ASI	Archaeological Survey of India.
EC	Epigraphia Carnatica.
EI	Epigraphia Indica.
Ec.Life	Economic Life in the Vijayanagara Empire by T.V. Mahalingam.
IA	Indian Antiquary.
Further Sources	Further Sources of Vijayanagar History.
HJMU	Half-yearly Journal of the Mysore University.
IHQ	Indian Historical Quarterly.
JAHRS	Journal of the Andhra Historical Society.
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.
JIH	Journal of Indian History.
JASB	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
JOR	Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.
KI	Karnātaka Inscriptions.
KNV	Keḷadinṛipavijaya by Linganna.
MAR	Annual Reports of the Mysore Archaeological Department.
Nel.Ins.	Nellore District Inscriptions.

PIHC	Proceedings of the Indian History Congress.
IPS	Chronological List of Inscriptions of the Pudukkottai State.
QJMS	Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society.
Soc. & Pol.Life	Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire - B.A. Saletore.
Studies	Studies in the History of the Third Dynasty of Vijayanagara by N. Venkataramanayya.
Sources	Sources of Vijayanagara History by S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar.
SII	South Indian Inscriptions.
SIP	South Indian Polity by T.V. Mahalingam.
TTDI	Tirumalai Tirupathi Dēvasthānam Inscriptions.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

(A) Inscriptions:

Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India, 1887 onwards, Calcutta.

Annual Reports of the Mysore Archaeological Department, 1908 onwards.

Annual Reports of South Indian Epigraphy, Madras, 1887-1951.

Archaeological Survey of Southeren India - Lists of Antiquarian Remains in the Presidency of Madras, by Sewell, Robert, 2 Vols. Madras 1882-84.

Archaeological Survey of Southern India - Vol. IV, Tamil and Sanskrit Inscriptions by Burgess, James with translations by Pandit M. Natesa Sastri, Madras, 1886.

The Descriptive Lists of Stone and Copper-plate Inscriptions, examined by the Kannada Research Institute during the years 1941-42 to 1942-43 (Dharwar, 1961).

Summaries of the Inscriptions, 1943-44 to 1949-50 by Desai, P?B. Dharwar, 1966.

A Corpus of Inscriptions in the Kannada Districts of Hyderabad State, by Desai, P.B. Hyderabad, 1958.

Epigraphia Carnatica, Vols. 1-16, Bangalore.

Epigraphia Indica, Calcutta, 1892 onwards.

Hyderabad Archaeological Series.

Annual Report on the Kannada Research in Bombay Province for 1939-40 ed. by Panchamukhi, R.S. (Dharwar- 1941).

+ Karnātak Inscriptions. vols 1-5 (Dharwar)

Inscriptions of the Deccan by Naik, A.V., Poona, 1947.

Nellore District Inscriptions by Butterworth, A. and Venugopal Chetty, V. 3 Vols. Madras, 1905.

Chronological List of Inscriptions of the Pudukkottai State, 1929.

Pudukkottai State Inscriptions, Puddukkottai, 1929.

A Topographical List of the Inscriptions of the Madras Presidency by Rangacharya, V. Vols. 1-3, Madras, 1919.

Historical Inscriptions of Southern India by Sewell, Robert and Krishnaswamy Aiyangar, S. Madras, 1932.

Report on the Inscriptions of Tirumalai Tirupati Dēvasthānam by Subramanya Sastri, S. Madras, 1930.

South Indian Inscriptions, 1890 onwards, Vols. 1 to 15, 17 & 20.

Tirumalai Tirupati Dēvasthānam Inscriptions, 6 Vols. Madras, 1937-1951.

Travancore Archaeological Series.

(B) Literature:

Aiyangar, Krishnaswamy, S. The Sources of Vijayanagara History, (Madras, 1919).

Basavaraja, Śivatattavaratnākara, Edited by B. Rama Rao and Sundara Sastri (Mangalore, 1927).

Bhāskarāchārya, Vaiśyapurāṇamu (Madras, 1929).

~~Gundappa, D.V. Vidyāraṇya Vijaya, (Mysore, 1941).~~

Kautilya's Arthaśāstra Translated by R. Shama Sastri, (Bangalore, 1923).

Linganna, Keladi Nripavijaya Edited by R. Shama Sastri, (Mysore, 1921).

Mādhava Parāśara-Mādhavīyam or Vidyāraṇya Smriti, A portion of this work on Law and Government was translated by A.C. Burnell, under the title Dāyabhāga, (Madras, 1868).

The Institutes of Parāśara, Tr. into English, Krishnakamal Bhattacharya, (Calcutta, 1887).

Manu, the laws of, translated by George Buhler, Sacred Books of the East XXV, (Oxford, 1886).

Venkanna Chincholi, (Editor) Parāśara Saṁhitā or Parāśara Mādhavīya Dharma-Śāstra (Bangalore, 1890).

Rāyavāchakamu, published in the Journal of the Telugu Academy, Vol.III (Madras).

Sōmēśvara III, Mānasōllāsa Vol.II, Edited by Shrigondekar, G.K. Gaekwad's Oriental Series LXXXIV, (Baroda, 1939).

Śukrāchārya, Śukranīti, translated by Sarkar, B.K. (Allahabad, 1913).

Venkataramanayya, N. & K.A. Nilakanta Sastri, Further Sources of Vijayanagara History, 3 Vols. (Madras, 1946).

Vijñānēśvara, Mitākshara (Second Edition, Edited by Gharpure, J.R. Bombay, 1939).

Wilson, H.H. The Mackenzie Collection, A Descriptive catalogue of the Oriental Manuscripts, and other articles illustrative of History, statistics and antiquities of the South of India, collected by the late H.H. Wilson (2nd edition), 2 Vols. (Calcutta, 1828, Madras, 1882).

(C) Chronicles and Travels:

× Abdur Razaak in Elliot and Dowson, History of India as told by its own historians Vol.IV (London, 1872).

Barbosa, Duarte, The Book of Duarte Barbosa, translated with notes etc., by Longworth Dames, 2 Vols. (London, 1918).

Caesar Frederick in Samual Purchas, His Pilgrims, Vol.X, (Glasglow, 1905).

Chronicle of Domingo Paes - translated by Robert Sewell in 'A Forgotten Empire', pp.229-278.

Chronicle of Fernao Nuniz-Translated by Robert Sewell in 'A Forgotten Empire, pp.279-380.

The Story of Barradas (1614) - Translated by Robert Sewell in 'A Forgotten Empire', pp.213-227.

Firishtah, Mohamed Kassim, History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India, till the year 1612 - translated by John Briggs 4 vols. (Calcutta, 1908-10).

Ibn Batuta - Edited by Denison Ross and Eileen Power, (London, 1929).

Modern Works:

Altekar, A.S. A History of Village Communities in Western India, (Madras, 1927).

Altekar, A.S. State and Government in Ancient India, (Benares, 1949).

Aiyangar, Krishnaswamy, S.
(1) Ancient India (Madras, 1911)
(2) A Little known chapter of Vijayanagar History, (Madras, 1916).
(3) The yet-remembered Ruler of a long-forgotten empire, Krishnadēvarāya of Vijayanagara A.D.1509-1530, (Madras, 1917).
(4) South India and her Mohammedan Invaders (Oxford, 1921).
(5) Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture, (Calcutta, 1923).
(6) Evolution of the Hindu Administrative Institutions in Southern India, (Madras, 1931).
(7) A History of Tirupati, 2 Vols. (Madras, 1940).
(8) Ancient India and South Indian History and Culture, 2 Vols. (Poona, 1941).

Aiyar, Subramanya, K.V. Historical Sketches of Ancient Dakhan, 2 Vols. (Madras, 1917).

Appadorai, A. Economic Conditions in Southern India, 1000-1500 A.D., Vols. 1 and 2, (Madras, 1936).

Baden Powell, B.P. The Indian Village Community, (London, 1896).

Beni Prasad, The State in Ancient India (Allahabad, 1928).

Bombay Gazetteer.

Bhandarkar, R.G. Early History of the Deccan Down to the Muslim Conquest (Calcutta, 1928).

Burnell, A.C. Elements of South Indian Palaeography from 4th to the 7th Century A.D. (London, 1878).

Dikshit, G.S. Local Self-Government in Mediaeval Karnataka (Dharwar, 1964).

Dikshitar, V.R.R. (1) Hindu Administrative Institutions (Madras, 1929).

(2) Studies in Tamil Literature and History (Madras, 1936).

Elphinstone, Mount Stuart, The History of India, the Hindu and the Mohometan Periods (Allahabad, 1966).

Francis, W. (1) Anantpur, Madras District Gazetters (Madras, 1905).

(2) Bellary, Madras District Gazetters (Madras, 1904).

(3) Madras, 2 Vols. Madras District Gazetters, (Madras, 1906).

(4) South Arcot Madras District Gazetters (Madras, 1906).

Gribble, A History of the Deccan, 2 Vols. (London, 1895-1924).

Gundappa, D.V. Vidyāranya Vijaya or Vijayanagara Rājya Sthāpane, (Mysore, 1941).

Hayavadana Rao, C. Mysore Gazetter, Vol.II, part iii, (Bangalore, 1930).

Hemingway, C.R. Tanjore, Madras Gazetteers (1906).

Heras, Henry, The Aravidu Dynasty of Vijayanagara, (Madras, 1927).

Karnātaka Through the Ages (Published by the Government of Mysore, Bangalore, 1968).

(1) Dikshit, G.S. Social and Economic Life, Ch.XII.

(2) Rajagopala Rao, N. The Rulers of Keladi, Ch.XIII.

Kittel, A Kanarese-English Dictionary, (Mangalore, 1894).

Krishnaswamy, A. The Tamil Country Under Vijayanagar (Annamalainagar, 1964).

Lach, Donald, F. India in the Eyes of Europe, The Sixteenth Century, (Chicago, 1968).

Longshurst, H.A. Hampi Ruins described and illustrated, (Madras, 1917).

Mahalingam, T.V. Administration and Social Life under Vijayanagara, (Madras, 1940).

Mahalingam, T.V. Economic Life in the Vijayanagara Empire, (Madras, 1951).

Mahalingam, T.V. South Indian Polity, (Madras, 1955).

Majumdar, Ramesh Chandra, Corporate Life in Ancient India (II Ed. Poona, 1922).

Manual of the North Area District, Madras District Gazetteers. New Edition, 2 Vols. (Madras, 1894-95).

Menon, Shangonny, P. A History of Travancore from the Earliest Times, (Madras, 1873).

Menon, Padmanabha, History of Kērala, Ed. by T.K. Krishna Menon, (Ernakulum, 1924).

Mookerjee, Radha Kumud, Local Government in Ancient India, (III Edition, New Delhi, 1956).

Moore, L. Trichinopoly, Madras District Gazetters (Madras, 1898).

Mugali, R.S. The Heritage of Karnātaka, (Bangalore,1946).

Mugali, R.S. Kannada Sāhitya Charitre, (Mysore, 1960).

Narasimha Rao, R. Corporate Life in Mediaeval Andhra Pradesh (Secunderabad, 1967).

Nilakanta Sastri, K.A. Studies in Chola History and Administration, (Madras, 1932).

Nilakanta Sastri, K.A. The Cholas, II Edn. (Madras, 1955).

Nilakanta Sastri, K.A. A History of South India, III Edn. (Madras, 1966).

Pate, H.R. Tinnevelly, Madras District Gazetters, 2 Vols. (Madras, 1917).

Puttanna, M.S. History of Ikkēri, (Bangalore, 1931).

Ramesh, K.V. Tulunādina Ithihāsa, (Mysore, 1969).

Rice, B. Lewis, Mysore Gazetters, 2 Vols. (Westminister, 1897).

Rice, B. Lewis, Mysore and Coorg from Inscriptions, (London, 1909).

Saletore, B.A. Ancient Karnātaka, Vol.I, History of Tuluva (Poona, 1936).

Saletore, B.A. Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire) (A.D.1346-1646), Vols. 2, (Madras, 1934).

Sathianathaier, R. History of the Nāyaks of Madura, (Madras, 1924).

Sewell, Robert, A Forgotten Empire, I, Indian Edition (Delhi, 1962).

Somasekhara Sarma, M. History of the Reddi Kingdoms (1325 A.D. to 1448 A.D.), (Waltair, 1948).

Stuart, H.A. South Canara, Madras District Gazetters, 2 Vols. (Madras, 1895).

Swaminathan, K.D. The Nāyakas of Ikkēri, (Madras, 1957).

Venkateswara, S.V. Indian Culture Through the Ages, 2 Vols. (Mysore, 1932).

Venkataraman, K.R. The Throne of Transcendental Wisdom (Tiruchirapalli, 1959).

Venkataramanayya, N. Origin of Vijayanagara, The City and the Empire, (Madras, 1933).

Venkataramanayya, N. Studies in the History of the Third Dynasty of Vijayanagara, (Madras, 1935).

~~Venkataramanayya, N. Further Sources of Vijayanagara History (Madras, 1946)~~

Vijayanagara Sex-Centenary Commemoration Volume, (Dharwar, 1936)

Wilks, Mark, Historical Sketches of the South of India in an Attempt to Trace the History of Mysore, 3 Vols. (London, 1820).

Articles in Research Journals:

Acharyulu, Raghava, K. Rāyavāchakamu and Other Telugu Sources for Krishnadēva Rāya's Reign, (JAHRS), IV, pp.221-226).

Aiyangar, Krishnaswamy, S.
(1) Social Legislation Under Hindu Governments, (QJMS, VI, pp.47-57)
(2) Landmarks in South Indian History, (QJMS, V, pp.27-37).
(3) Mysore and the Decline of the Vijayanagara Empire, (QJMS, XIII, pp.621-627).
(4) Foundationof Vijayanagara 742 - 754 (QJMS, XI).
(5) Virūpāksha II (Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, 1917, pp.255-264).
(6) A Little Known Chapter of Vijayanagar History from 1450-1509, (Hindustan Review, 1911).
(7) Mysore Under the Wodeyars (Madras Review, May 1960).
(8) Rāja Dēsing of Gingee (JIH Vol.IX).
(9) Rāmarāya of Vijayanagara (Sardesai Commemoration Volume 1938).

Aiyar, Ramanatha, A.S. The Climateric of Tālikōta (JIH, VI, Part I, pp.67-79.)

Ayyar, Venkatarama, K.P. Anarchy in a part of the Tamilnad - How the people faced it? pp.300-305P.I.H.Q, 1944.

Baden Powell, B.H. A Study of the Deccna Villages, their origin and development (JRAS, 1897, pp.239-279).

Baden Powell, B.H. The originof village land-tenures in India (JRAS, 1896, pp.605-616).

Baden Powell, B.H. The Villages of Goa inthe Early Sixteenth Century, (JRAS for 1900, pp.261-291).

Desikachari, T. Numismatics with special reference to the City of Vijayanagar (QJMS, III, p.1).

Dikshit, G.S. Economic Conditions in the time of Krishnadeva Rāya, Vijayanagara Sex Centenary Commemoration Volume, pp.213-231.

Dutt, Iswara, K. Studies in Vijayanagara Polity, A.D.1336-1542, (JAHRS), Vol.IV, 1930, pp.165-188; Vol.V, 1931, pp. 7 - 20).

Fleet, J.V. Three Copper Plate Grants of the kings of Vijayanagar, (JBBRAS, XII, pp.336-399).

Heras, Henry, (1) The City of Jingi at the end of the 16th Century, (IA, LIV, pp.41-43).

(2) Goa Viragal at the time of Harihara II of Vijayanagar (QJMS, pp.1-28) .

(3) Jesuit Influence at the Court of Vijayanagar (QJMS, XIV, pp.130-140).

(4) The Statues of the Nayaks of Madura in Pudumantapam, (QJMS, XV, pp.209-18).

(5) Venkatapatirāya I and the Portuguese (QJMS, XIV, pp.312-317).

(6) Early Relations Between Vijayanagara and Portugal (QJMS, XXI, pp.63-74).

(7) Seven days at Vijayanagar (QJMS, XX, p.103)

(8) Rāmadēvarāya II an Unknown Emperor of Vijayanagara (JBORS, XVI, pp.137-153).

(9) The Great Civil Wars of Vijayanagara (JIH, V, pp.164-189).

(10) A New Partapa of Krishnadēva Rāya of Vijayanagara (JIH, VII, pp.34-35).

(11) Rāmarāya of Vijayanagar (IHQ, I, pp.79-85, 226-233).

Iyengar, Krishnaswamy, B.S. Expansion of Vijayanagar in the South, (HJMU, XI, pp.21-30).

Iyer, Subramanya, V. Mādhavāchārya and his Younger Brothers (QJMS, VII, pp.217-224).

Krishnamacharyulu, C.R. The Religion of Vijayanagara House (IA, XLIV, pp.219-225).

-do- The Origin, Growth and Decline of the Vijayanagara Empire (IA, LII, pp.9-12).

Mahalingam, T.V. Two Centuries of Madura, (PIHC, 1945).

Narashimcharya, R. Mādhavāchārya and his Younger Brothers (QJMS, VI, pp.318-320).

Nilakanta Sastri, K.A. Last Days of Vijayanagar (Sardesai CommemorationVolume, 1938).

Puttaiya, B. The Kempe Gowda Chiefs, (QJMS, XI, pp.261-66).

Rangachari, V. A History of the Naik Kingdom of Madura, (IA, XLIII, pp.1, Seq. XLIV, p.37. Seq. XLV, p.32).

Rama, Rao, R. Some problems of Identity in the Early History of Vijayanagar (QJMS, XIX, pp.251-69).

R Rama, Rao, S. Vidyāranya and Mādhavāchārya (IHQ, VI, pp.701 - 717).

Reo, Hanumantha, S. The Influence of the Religious School of Srī Mādhava on the History of Vijayanagar (QJMS, XX, pp.284-287).

Rao, Venkata Gurty, Sources for the History of Vijayanagar (JIH, pp.249-264).

Saletore, B.A. (1) The Rise of Vijayanagara, (IHQ, VIII, pp.294-301, 768-774, IX, pp.521-566).

Saletore, B.A. (2) Dynastic Continuity of Vijayanagara History, (IA, LXII, 1933, pp.1-11).

(3) Yachama Nayaka, the King-maker (JIH, Vol.XIII, p.51).

Sarma, Rama, Studies in Vijayanagara History (QJMS, XX, pp.5-14, 89-106 & 210-211).

Sastri, Srikanta, S. Devaraya, II (IA, VII, pp.77-85).

Sastri, Krishna, H. (i) The First Vijayanagara Dynasty: its Viceroy's and Ministers (ASI 1907-08, pp.235-253).

(ii) The Second Vijayanagara Dynasty: Its Viceroys and Ministers (ASI, 1908-09, pp.164-201).

(iii) The Third Vijayanagara Dynasty: Its Viceroys and Ministers (ASI, 1911-12, pp.177-197).

Sewell, Robert, A Note on Virupaksha of Vijayanagara (IA, XXXIV, p.19).

H K. / Sherwani, Mahamad, III and the Fall of Vijayanagar (JIH XIX, pp.45-55, 249).

Slater, A.R. Ruins of Vijayanagar (QJMS, II, pp.49-55).

Srinivasachari, C.S. The Origin of the Right Hand and Left Hand Divisions, (JAHRS, IV, pp.77-85).

Sundaram, K. The Balanja Merchant Community of Medieval Andhra, Journal of Oriental Research, XXX, 1960-61.

Thiruvenkatachari, S. Kampana a Viceroy of Vijayanagara (PIHC, 1945). pp 215-229

~~Venkataraman, K.R. The Throne of Transcendental Wisdom.~~

Venkataramanayya, N. (1) Founders of Vijayanagara Before the Foundationof the City (JOR, XII, pp.17-30).

(2) Ballala III and Vijayanagar (JAHRS, V, pp.123-136).

****
*****
***
*

KARNATAK UNIVERSITY